









RIG-VEDA-SANHITA,  
THE  
SACRED HYMNS OF THE BRAHMANS;  
TOGETHER WITH THE  
COMMENTARY OF SAYANACHARYA.

EDITED BY

F. MAX MÜLLER, M. A.

Foreign Member of the French Institute, of the Royal Sardinian Academy, of the Royal Bavarian Academy, of the Royal Irish Academy, of the Royal Society of Upsala, of the American Philosophical Society; Honorary Member of the German Oriental Society, of the Royal Asiatic Society, of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, of the Royal Society of Literature, of the Literary Society of Leyden, of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, of the Ethnographic Society of Paris, of the American Oriental Society, of the Archæological Society of Moscow, of the American Philological Society; Corresponding Member of the Royal Academy of Berlin, of the Royal Society of Göttingen, of the Royal Academy of Lisbon; Honorary Doctor of Laws in the Universities of Cambridge and Edinburgh; Ph.D. in the University of Leipzig; Professor of Comparative Philology, and Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, &c. &c.

VOLUME V.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

HER MAJESTY'S SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA IN COUNCIL.

LONDON:

W<sup>M</sup>. H. ALLEN AND CO., 13, WATERLOO-PLACE, S. W.,  
PUBLISHERS TO THE INDIA OFFICE.

1872.

**Oxford:**

**PRINTED BY T. COMBE, M.A., E. B. GARDNER, AND E. PICKARD HALL,  
PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.**

TO  
HER MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
VICTORIA,  
QUEEN OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND,  
THIS EARLIEST RECORD  
OF THE RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS OF THE NATIVES OF INDIA  
IS BY GRACIOUS PERMISSION  
DEDICATED  
BY  
HER MAJESTY'S  
FAITHFUL SUBJECT AND DEVOTED SERVANT,

F. MAX MÜLLER.



# P R E F A C E.

AFTER five years spent in the collection of materials for an Edition of the Rig-veda and its Sanskrit Commentary by Sāyaṇāchārya, the first volume is now completed, comprising the first Ashtaka (Ogdoad), and about the fourth part of the whole<sup>a</sup>.

When I first entered on this undertaking, I saw but little chance that I should ever succeed in carrying it out, and my only hope of success was derived from the firm conviction that, in the present state of philological, historical, and philosophical research, no literary work was of greater importance and interest to the philologist, the historian, and philosopher, than the *Veda*, the oldest literary monument of the Indo-European world. There were many difficulties to be overcome in carrying out this work. In the public Libraries of Germany no MSS. of the Rig-veda and its Commentary were to be found, except some old copies of the text and a small and worm-eaten fragment of Sāyaṇa's Commentary in the Royal Library at Berlin. It was necessary, therefore, to spend several years in the Libraries of Paris, London, and Oxford, in order to copy and collate all the necessary Vaidik MSS. A complete *apparatus criticus* having been brought together in this manner, it became possible to commence a philological study of the Rig-veda, and to prepare upon a safe basis a critical edition of both its text and commentary. But a still greater difficulty remained, the expense of publishing such a work. These obstacles have been such, that although the want of an edition of the Veda has been keenly felt by all Sanskrit scholars, and although there were many fully qualified for such a work, yet no one has been found to undertake it, since the first edition of the

<sup>a</sup> An introductory Memoir on the Veda is in the Press, and will be published separately.

Rig-veda by the late Dr. Rosen was interrupted by the early death of that highly-gifted scholar. It is owing to a concurrence of many fortunate circumstances, and particularly to the kind encouragement and liberal assistance which I have received from various quarters, that these difficulties have been at length overcome. For several years I was able to advance but slowly, being entirely left to my own resources, and having but few leisure hours to bestow upon Vaidik studies. But the further I proceeded in my work, the more encouragement I received. Amongst those who took an active interest in it, I have to mention with sincere gratitude the names of Alexander von Humboldt and Professor E. Burnouf in France, and of Chevalier Bunsen and Professor H. H. Wilson in England. The final success, however, of this undertaking is owing to the well-known liberality of the Honourable the Court of Directors of the East-India-Company, whose enlightened views on this subject cannot be better expressed than in their own words: "The Court consider that the publication of so important and interesting a work as that to which your proposals refer, is in a peculiar manner deserving of the patronage of the East-India-Company, connected as it is with the early religion, history, and language of the great body of their Indian subjects."

This first edition, however, of the Rig-veda and its Sanskrit Commentary is not intended for the general scholar, but only for those who make Sanskrit their special study, and for those among the natives of India who are still able to read their own Sacred Books in the language of the original. It would have been more agreeable to myself to have kept for my own use the materials which I had collected for the Veda, (I allude especially to the Sanskrit Commentary,) devoting all my time to their study, and communicating to the public the last results only of my researches. But I felt that I should perform a more useful work by at once making public those materials, without which no philological study of the Veda was possible. A greater number of Sanskrit scholars will thus be enabled to contribute their share towards the elucidation of Vaidik antiquities, and we may now look forward to a more complete study of Vaidik literature than it is in the power of any single individual to bestow upon so comprehensive a subject, and to a better understanding of Vaidik language, religion, and mythology, than can be expected from a scholastic Indian commentator of the fourteenth century after Christ.

I determined therefore on publishing first a complete text of the Rig-veda-

sanhitá, (the Sanhitá and the Pada-text,) together with the only complete commentary on the Rig-veda now existing, the Mádhaviya-vedártha-prakáśa by Sáyaṇáchárya. As the limits of this publication were fixed, it became necessary to save space as much as possible, in order to get at least the whole of the text and commentary into the prescribed compass of the edition. For this reason, as well as because this edition was destined for the use of Indian as well as European scholars, I had to exclude, and to reserve for a separate work, all critical and explanatory notes of my own, together with the various readings of the MSS.

My principal object in this present edition is therefore to give a correct text of the Rig-veda, and to restore from the MSS. a readable and authentic text of Sáyaṇa's commentary. The former was by far the easier task. The MSS. of the Rig-veda have generally been written and corrected by the Brahmans with so much care that there are no various readings in the proper sense of the word, except those few which are found noticed as such in the Commentaries or in the Prátisákhya. Even these are generally of small importance, and seldom affect the meaning of a sentence. For the most part they arise from niceties of orthography and calligraphy, which by themselves are of little importance to a European scholar, though they may become of interest if considered with reference to the peculiarities of the old Śákhas or branches of the Veda. The hymns of the Rig-veda are happily much more free from these orthographic minutiae than the prayers of the Sáma and Yajur-veda. Of real importance, however, for critical purposes, are the alterations which the verses of the Rig-veda have undergone when incorporated into the ceremonial prayers of the Sáma, Yajur, and Atharva-vedas. But neither are these alterations to be considered in the light of *variae lectiones*, and, as they cannot be used for a critical restoration of the received text of the Rig-veda, they will better be considered in a general critical account of the whole Vaidik literature <sup>b</sup>.

For the text of the Rig-veda I have made use of the following MSS.

### I. *Sanhitá-text.*

S. 1. A manuscript in the collection of the Rev. Dr. Mill, now belonging to the Bodleian Library at Oxford. It contains all the eight Ashtakas (Ogdoads)

<sup>b</sup> The importance of these alterations has been pointed out by Professor Benfey, in his valuable edition of the Sáma-veda-sanhitá; Introduction, p. lvii. "Die Hymnen des

Sáma-veda herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit Glossar versehen von Theodor Benfey, Leipzig, F. A. Brockhaus, 1848.



of the Rig-veda. The first Ashtaka consists of 89 leaves without a date, the last leaves having been replaced by a modern hand. The second comprises 70 leaves, and has no date. The third, of 92 leaves, is dated Samvat 1777. The fourth, of 100 leaves, is dated Samvat 1776. The fifth, of 102 leaves, is dated Samvat 1771. The sixth, of 104 leaves, has no date, the last leaves being of more modern origin. The seventh consists of 90 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1777. At the end of the sixth Adhyāya, Vargas 14—28 are wanting in this MS., but have been added afterwards by the original writer on two separate leaves. The eighth Ashtaka consists of 104 leaves, without date. There are four different handwritings to be distinguished in this manuscript. Ashtakas 3—7 are written by the same hand, about the year A. D. 1720, at Benares. The name of the writer, however, is every where carefully scratched out with yellow ink. The last ten leaves of the sixth Ashtaka are written by the same person, who copied the second Ashtaka. The first and last Ashtakas again are copied by a third writer: while some few leaves on white paper belong to a fourth and quite modern hand, and have probably been supplied by the Pandit employed by Dr. Mill.

S. 2. Another manuscript in the collection of Dr. Mill, now belonging to the Bodleian Library. This also is a complete copy of all the eight Ashtakas. The first Ashtaka consists of 103 leaves, without date. The second has 93 leaves, and is dated Śāka 1679 (A. D. 1757). The third fills 97 leaves, and is dated Śāka 1677. The fourth comprises 92 leaves, and is dated Śāka 1679. The fifth consists of 62 leaves; the sixth of 80 leaves; and the seventh of 76 leaves; all of them without dates. Leaves 12—37 in the seventh Ashtaka have been supplied by a modern writer. The eighth Ashtaka comprises 130 leaves, and is dated Śāka 1776. In this manuscript also four different writers can be distinguished: to the first belong Ashtakas 1—4; to the second, Ashtakas 5—7; to the third, the eighth Ashtaka; and to the fourth, the modern additions in the seventh Ashtaka.

S. 3. The third manuscript belongs to Mr. Colebrooke's collection, deposited in the Library of the East-India-House, where it forms Nos. 129—132 of the Catalogue. No. 129 contains the Grihya-sūtras of Áśvalāyana and the first and second Ashtakas. The first Ashtaka contains 59 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1802: the second contains 60 leaves, and is of the same date. No. 130 contains the third and fourth Ashtakas; the former of 53, the latter of 54 leaves;

both dated Samvat 1802. No. 131 contains Ashtakas 5 and 6; the former of 54 leaves, the latter of 56 leaves; both dated Samvat 1802. No. 132 contains the Sarvānukrama and Ashtakas 7 and 8; the former of 56, the latter of 61 leaves; equally dated Samvat 1802. The whole Manuscript was evidently written by one person, about the year 1745: his name is scratched out, but seems to have been Somagopakāśinātha.

## II. *Pada-text.*

P. 1. A manuscript in Dr. Mill's collection, now belonging to the Bodleian Library. It contains all the eight Ashtakas. The first Ashtaka consists of 97 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1727, Śāka 1592 (A.D. 1670). The second contains 129 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1728. The third fills 109 leaves, and is not dated. The fourth has 107 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1727. The fifth contains 84 leaves, without a date; the last leaf having been supplied by a modern hand. The sixth Ashtaka comprises 89 leaves, and is not dated. The seventh consists of 95 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1672 (A.D. 1615). It was difficult, however, to read the last page, which contains the date and the name of the writer, but has been pasted over with yellow paper<sup>c</sup>. The eighth Ashtaka contains 86 leaves, but breaks off with the last Varga of the seventh Adhyāya. The rest has been supplied by a modern manuscript, without accents, dated Samvat 1857, Śāka 1722 (A.D. 1800). In this manuscript also four different hands may be traced. The oldest part is the seventh and eighth Ashtakas, written in A.D. 1615: next come Ashtakas 1—6, written in A.D. 1760: thirdly, the supplement of the eighth Ashtaka, written in A.D. 1800: and lastly, some few leaves of still more modern origin, probably copied by a Pandit employed by Dr. Mill.

P. 2. A complete copy of the Rig-veda-sanhitā, bequeathed by John Taylor M.D., to the Hon. Court of Directors of the East-India-Company, and entered

<sup>c</sup> All that can be read is स्वस्ति संवत् १-७२ वर्षो  
 शे --- श्रीद्व - गरवास्तव । अ --- ज्ञातीयव्यपुस्ते ---  
 Even this has been traced over with ink, by  
 which it became still more illegible. After-  
 wards another writer has given the date at  
 which the accents were added, but there also  
 we can only read संवत् १६— etc. To judge from

the handwriting of the MS. and from the  
 fragmentary passages which are still legible,  
 I conclude the MS. to have been written by  
 Damodara-Sadāśiva, who generally signs him-  
 self श्रीवृद्धनागरवास्तव्यं आभ्यन्तरनागरज्ञातीयव्यपुस्ते-  
 षोत्तमसुतसदाशिवेन (or दमोदरेण or दमोदरसदाशिवेन)  
 लिखितं । He was still alive in Samvat 1706.

in the Catalogue under No. 2032. It has been copied at Bombay, and is bound together in one large volume: its date is from Śāka 1736 to 1737: the name of the writer Rāmabhaṭṭa, called Śebenkara.

It was not necessary for an editor of the Rig-veda to collate a greater number of MSS., or to classify them according to their age and origin. I have seen nearly all the MSS. of the Rig-veda which exist in Europe, and I feel convinced that no use can be derived from them as manuscripts, because all of them are but transcripts, more or less carefully executed, of one and the same text<sup>d</sup>. If there were, as in other Sanskrit works, corrupt passages, on which doubts might exist, a comparison of the Sanhitā-text with the Pada-text, or a reference to the Commentary, would have been sufficient to remove such doubts. But so far from this being required, the reading of the Sanhitā-text, the Pada-text, and the text which the commentator had before him, can each be established with such certainty by the MSS., that it would be wrong to correct even the smallest differences in the quantity or accent of vowels which occur occasionally between these three texts, but which are always supported by the full testimony of each class of MSS. There are instances in almost every hymn where a long vowel occurs in the Sanhitā-text, while the Pada-text has a short one. The commentator considers these productions of a short vowel as Vaidik liberties. But in some cases where a long vowel seems to be regular, and the Pada-text has notwithstanding a short one instead, this shortening is equally pronounced by Śāyana as a Vaidik irregularity: for instance, Rv. 1, 37, 11. च्यवयंति instead of च्यावयंति<sup>e</sup>; 1, 61, 14. भूम instead of भूमा<sup>f</sup>. Instances occur where the text followed by the commentator is different from the text of our MSS. Rv. 1, 48, 5. पङ्क is both in the Sanhitā and Pada-text an oxytone, while Śāyana explains it as a paroxytone. Rv. 1, 116, 1. the Pada-text has अग्नेगाय, while, according to Śāyana, the author of the Pada-text (Śākalya) must have read अग्नेऽगाय. Rv. 1, 61, 9. the Pada-text ought to have, according

<sup>d</sup> The late Dr. F. Rosen, who had undertaken an edition of the Rig-veda, part of which was published after his lamented death in 1837, has for the same reason given no various readings for the text of the Sanhitā: and I may also quote Dr. A. Kuhn of Berlin, on the same subject, as a later but not less weighty authority on questions connected

with Vaidik literature; Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik, Berlin, 1844, p. 131.

<sup>e</sup> पदकाले ह्रस्वश्छांदसः ॥

<sup>f</sup> छांदसमन्त्रं पादकारिः कृतं ॥ Cf. 1, 84, 4. सादने; 1, 84, 6. the short *i* in रथितर instead of रथीतर is called अथयहसमये छांदसं ह्रस्वं; while 1, 11, 1. रथीतमं रथीनां is explained by रथशब्दादुत्पन्नत्ये-नश्छांदसं दीधत् ॥ Cf. Pāṇini, VIII. 2, 17, 2.

to Sáyana, खऱाह्, but all the MSS. have खऱाह्. Rv. 1, 52, 10. रोदसी has no accent in the Sanhitá and Pada-text, while Sáyana explains it as if it were a paroxytone §.

Notwithstanding the great accuracy with which the MSS. are written, occasional mistakes occur. Letters, syllables, and words are sometimes left out, sometimes misplaced in one or other of the MSS., owing to inevitable inadvertencies on the part of the copyist<sup>h</sup>. They never occur, however, in more than one MS. in each instance, and I know only one case in the first Ashtaka where a real *varietas lectionis* might seem to have arisen in this manner, Rv. 1, 112, 19: MSS. S. 1, 2, 3. and P. 1. have ऊह्युः, which Rosen has adopted; while P. 2. and the Commentator have निःऊह्युः.

As to the spelling of words, I have endeavoured as much as possible to preserve consistency, and never to deviate from the general laws of Sanskrit orthography, except where Vaidik peculiarities were based on the unanimous authority of all the MSS. Each MS. has its own peculiar character, which must be known and taken into account in order to make proper use of it<sup>i</sup>.

§ Sáyana does not explain how रोदसी could be without an accent in the text, though generally he endeavours to account for irregular accents; that is to say, to reconcile them with the rules of Pāṇini. See, for instance, 1, 61, 1. where he even admits of a स्वरश्चितनीयः ॥

<sup>h</sup> This the writers of MSS. admit themselves in several cases. For although they generally say at the end of a MS. that they have copied it as it was in the original, and that it is not their fault if mistakes occur, yet they complain frequently of the hardships and difficulties of their work. I subjoin a few specimens of their poetry:

अहश्यभावात्मातिविभ्रमाद्वा पदार्थहीनं लिखितं मयात् ।  
तत्सर्वमार्थैः परिशीधनीयं कोपं न कुयुः खलु लेखकेषु ॥

“ If I have written a mistake here, because I could not see, or my mind was wandering, noble persons may correct it all, but let them not be angry with writers.”

मुनेरपि मतिभ्रंशो भीमस्यापि पराजयः ।  
यदि शुद्धमशुद्धं वा मम दोषो न दीयतां ॥

“ A Muni even may err; Bhīma even was vanquished: be it right or wrong, no fault must be given to me.”

यादृशं पुस्तकं दृष्ट्वा तादृशं लिखितं मया ।  
यदि शुद्धमशुद्धं वा मम दोषो न विद्यते ॥

“ As I have seen the book, so I have written it; be it right or wrong, it is not my fault.”

भग्नपृष्ठकटिग्रीव स्तब्धदृष्टिरधोमुखं ।  
कष्टेन लिखितं ग्रंथं यत्नेन प्रतिपालयेत् ॥

“ My back, my hips, and my neck are broken; my sight is stiff in looking down: keep this book with care which has been written with pain.” Others read वद्धमुष्टिः instead of स्तब्धदृष्टिः.

<sup>i</sup> Rv. 1, 50, 6. for instance, in order to support a conjecture, great stress has been laid on the fact that in भुरन्यं जनौ अतु, the long *a* of जनौ has been added by a later hand in S. 3. (Cf. Zur Literatur und Geschichte des Veda. Drei Abhandlungen von R. Roth. p. 82.) Yet though S. 3. is certainly a very accurate copy, it could scarcely be expected to have preserved traces of an older

Some MSS., for instance, avoid certain groups of double letters, not only where the reduplication arises from phonetic laws, but also where two independent letters have been joined together. This shorter way of writing occurs not only in Vaidik, but also in other MSS., and cannot be considered as affecting the pronunciation of words, because the simple letter makes the preceding vowel long, as if a double letter had been written. I have seen, therefore, no reason for adopting this way of spelling in a printed edition, because other Vaidik MSS., frequently give the double letters where they ought to stand, according to the laws of Sanskrit grammar, and because a deviation from these laws might lead to confusion. Some MSS. write a double aspirate, where, according to the laws of Sanskrit grammar, the first of the two letters ought not to be aspirated. I mean forms like अविद्धि instead of अविद्धि etc. As good MSS., however, restrict this peculiarity to the group द्ध instead of द्ध<sup>k</sup>, and as in this case also carefully written MSS. preserve the regular form द्ध, it would have been to no purpose to give up a general phonetic law (on the incompatibility of two aspirates) for what may be after all a mere difference in writing<sup>1</sup>. But although I have tried to be as consistent as possible in the way of spelling, yet I have submitted to the authority of the MSS. in cases where their testimony was quite unanimous,

reading than Yāska had before him in the Nirukta, where this verse is quoted (Nirukta, xii. 22) with the long *a*. The fact is, as will appear from a more accurate collation of this MS., that S. 3. dispenses most frequently with writing the long vowel in cases of Anu-nāsika in words where there can be no doubt that the long vowel is necessary, and where all the other MSS. have it. Instances of this occur continually, and have generally been corrected by the writer who added the accents; as in I, 48, 14. स्तोमं अभि; I, 45, 1. रुद्रं आदित्यं उत; I, 44, 1. देवं उषस्यः; I, 44, 4. देवं अञ्जा; I, 44, 7. देवं इह; I, 47, 5. अस्मै अवतं, etc. Sometimes the long vowel is not written, but, according to the laws of Vaidik grammar, the quantity is marked by a particular sign: Rv. I, 63, 1. महे२९इंद्र; I, 62, 12. हुमे२९असि; I, 59, 6. जयन्वे२९अधूनीत्; here also another hand has added the long vowel. Rv. I, 59, 1. again, we find जनं३९उप instead of जनौ

उप. This does not at all exclude the possibility of an old mistake in this verse (Rv. I. 50, 6), but it shows that, in order to make proper use of a MS. it is not sufficient to collate a few passages, but that the whole character of a MS. must be studied by a careful collation before it can be used as an authority for particular passages.

<sup>k</sup> Other groups, which also occur occasionally, but never in all the MSS. at the same time, are ध्, छ्, and ष्. Cf. Benfey, Sāma-veda, p. xxxiv.

<sup>1</sup> द्ध may be meant for द्ध, in the same way as क्क is meant frequently for क्क. Bukka's name is spelt बुक्क and बुक्क; and in words like शक्करी and शक्करी it is often difficult to say which form is meant; as words like पृथक्कृत also, where there can be no doubt as to the double *k* and its pronunciation, are written पृथक्कृत.

particularly with regard to nasal letters, because in such cases there was reason to suppose that certain peculiarities, if exhibited by all the MSS., might rest upon the authority of that Prātiśákhyā to which our MSS. belong. Whether with the conflicting testimonies of old Grammarians, quoted in the Prātiśákhyas, it will be possible to restore the whole Sanhitā of the Rig-veda in such a manner as to include all the minute niceties of spelling prescribed by different members of each Śákhā, is a question on which I should feel inclined entirely to submit to Professor Roth's authority, who has devoted much time and learning to this interesting branch of Vaidik literature.

There is only one case where I thought it better to deviate from the way of spelling adopted by the Vaidik MSS: this is with regard to the Avagraha. The Vaidik MSS. use the Avagraha where a hiatus arises from two vowels meeting at the end and beginning of two words, while the common custom has been to use this sign to mark the elision of an initial *a*, which has been dropped in order to avoid a hiatus between it and a preceding vowel. If the Vaidik use of the Avagraha had been adopted, it would have been necessary to introduce a new sign for cases of real elision, which the Vaidik MSS. do not mark at all. Instead of this I have preferred to retain the Avagraha where it is of real use in marking the place where a letter has been dropped, and to exclude it where it has no other purpose than that of marking a hiatus<sup>m</sup>, which is quite as clear to the eye without any such sign.

I have now to state the principles which I have followed in editing the Commentary of Sáyana. If the MSS. of the Rig-veda are generally the best, the MSS. of the Commentaries are nearly the worst to be met with in Sanskrit libraries: they have generally been copied by men who did not understand what they were writing, and the number of mistakes is at first sight quite

<sup>m</sup> The Avagraha is used in Vaidik MSS., not only where an elision ought to have taken place, according to the general laws of Sanskrit grammar; (for instance, ह्योऽच्यैः, च्यवैः, येऽच्यरीषु, पृथिवीऽजतः;) but also after those vowels which Sanskrit grammarians call prāgrihya, and which are never affected by a following vowel, like अजरयूऽजयानं, समानवंधूऽजमृतेऽजनूची, अस्तेऽजायुः. The same sign is put also after a vowel which

has been modified by the influence of one immediately following, as अस्माऽअथन्, विचःऽअथन्, दुरोऽअवः; and even where a final consonant has been dropped on account of a following vowel, as देवाऽअनु, विज्ञऽअजिगाति, कुर्भोऽअसिंचत. By being employed for so many purposes, and this not at all consistently, the Avagraha, as it stands in Vaidik MSS., is of little use.

discouraging. No class of writings would have needed more to be copied by men who were masters of their subject than commentaries such as these, which abound in short extracts, taken, without any further reference, from other books on grammatical, etymological, ceremonial, theological, and philosophical subjects. Most of these quotations are only detached fragments, full of technical expressions, and often quite unintelligible by themselves. In order to understand, nay frequently in order to read these passages, it was necessary to have recourse to the works from which they were taken. Some of these works were already published, but others existed only in MS., and had first to be analysed, and furnished with alphabetical indices, before any use could be made of them. By this process, however, a double advantage was gained. In most cases a comparison with the work from which passages were quoted served to correct the mistakes of the Commentary; while in other cases a frequent recurrence of the same quotation in the Commentary furnished also the means of correcting false readings in the original works, or supplied, at all events, a well-authenticated *varietas lectionis*. Sometimes, however, the same passage is quoted differently in different places of the Commentary. This may be accounted for by the fact that Indian authors trust so much to their memory as to quote generally by heart. Such slight differences, therefore, I have left unaltered whenever they were supported by the testimony of the best MSS.

As to the other part of the Commentary, which contains the original explanations of Mādhava, as edited by Sāyaṇa, a similar advantage for a critical restoration of corrupt passages was derived from the frequent repetition of the same explanations in different hymns, which also made it easier to become familiar with the style of the Commentator, and his whole way of thinking and interpreting the Veda. It was a further advantage that the MSS. were most numerous for the first book of the Commentary, and, as Sāyaṇa says with regard to the first Adhyāya of his Commentary, युग्मवस्तावता सर्वं बोद्धुं शक्नोति बुद्धिमान् “he who has got through this, can understand the rest,” it might, at all events, be said with some truth, that after having worked through the first Aṣṭaka, an editor may go on to the rest with a smaller number of MSS.

For the first Aṣṭaka I had twelve MSS. However, we have learnt from Greek and Latin philology that a great number of MSS. is not at all desirable for critical purposes. In most cases those numerous MSS. which have been

collated for classical authors have only served to spoil the text; to make the reading of doubtful passages still more doubtful; and to give rise to a mass of conjectural readings, based either upon the authority of the transcriber of a MS., or upon that of an ingenious editor. In this manner an immense deal of labour has been wasted in classical philology; so that now, after the simple rules for using MSS. have been laid down by a new school of critical philologists, such as Bekker, Dindorf, Lachmann, and others, almost all the old editions of classical authors have become useless for critical purposes, with the exception of some of the *editiones principes*, which, as they simply reproduced one MS., though generally a very bad one, can claim for themselves at least a certain degree of authenticity. Before MSS. can be used for critical purposes, it is necessary that they should themselves be examined critically, in order to determine their origin, their age, and their genealogical ramifications, and thus to fix their relative value. If it were possible to recover the original MS. of a work, as written by the author himself, there would be no need of criticism; we might dispense with all later MSS., and we should merely have to reproduce the original text, pointing out at the same time such mistakes as the author himself might have committed. But generally our MSS. are much later than the composition of the works which they contain, and, if compared with one another, they are found to differ from each other, partly in mistakes and omissions, partly in corrections and additions, arising, in the course of centuries, from the hands or heads of ignorant or learned transcribers. For the most part these various readings are not peculiar to one or the other MS. only, but the same mistakes occur generally in several MSS. at the same time. Now, if there are, for instance, certain MSS. which omit a certain number of passages that have been preserved in others, we may safely conclude that the MSS. which coincide in omitting these passages flow from the same original source. But out of the number of MSS. which thus coincide in omitting certain sentences, some may again differ in other characteristic passages, and thus form new classes and subdivisions. By carefully collecting a large number of such characteristic passages, all the MSS. of an author arrange themselves spontaneously, and form at last a kind of genealogical series, where each has its proper place, and commands, according to its position, but not according to its age, its proper share of authority. For a MS. may be of modern date, yet if by a comparison of certain classical passages it can be shown to have been



copied immediately from an old MS., it inherits, so to say, a greater share of authority than MSS. which, though of greater age, are of more distant relationship. Here, however, a distinction must be made between the authenticity and the correctness of a certain reading. As the date of the oldest MS. reaches but seldom to the age of the author of the work, we can only expect by a critical, and, so to say, genealogical arrangement of MSS., to arrive at the best authenticated, not at the original and correct text of an author. It sometimes happens, indeed, that all the MSS. of a work can be shown to have originated from one MS. which is still in existence, as is the case, for instance, with Sophocles. But most frequently there remain in the end two or more different groups of MSS., each with its own peculiar readings, and each group entirely independent of the other. In the former case the best that can be done in a merely critical edition is to reproduce the oldest and best authenticated MS. But it frequently happens, that even in the oldest MS., upon which all the others depend, mistakes occur, which have been corrected in more modern MSS., sometimes by mere conjecture, sometimes by using quotations from an author occurring in other works which have preserved a more ancient and more correct reading. Such passages are open to philological discussions, and have to be treated in notes. In the latter case, if there remain several independent branches of MSS., the task becomes more difficult; and as each class of MSS. may claim for itself the same degree of authenticity, it becomes the duty of an editor to choose in each particular case the reading of that class of MSS. which may seem to him most correct, and best in accordance with the general style of the author. Frequently, however, even in this case one class of MSS. will be discovered, which by its general character of correctness acquires a right to overrule the testimony of the other classes in doubtful passages. All this must be finally settled before a critical edition of any author can be commenced; and it is necessary, therefore, for an editor to collate most carefully even those passages where the various readings of MSS. bear the evident character of mere mistakes, but where, notwithstanding, the omission of a single letter may often serve to point out the connection of a certain class of MSS. Grave errors and long omissions are generally much less characteristic as marking a family likeness between certain MSS. than small and insignificant mistakes, because the former have often struck those who copied a MS., and have induced them to correct erroneous readings on their own authority, or to supply important

omissions from other MSS., in case they could be procured. The more insignificant mistakes, on the contrary, were more likely to be overlooked and to remain unaltered.

With regard to the twelve MSS. of the Commentary to the first Ashtaka of the Rig-veda, I have only succeeded in reducing them to three independent classes. It is not very likely that MSS. should still be found in India contemporaneous with Sáyana, though, if we could trust native authorities, copies of Sáyana's works have been buried in the ground near Vidyánagara. Excluding these MSS., the existence of which is extremely problematical, I am convinced that there are no MSS. at present which have any claim to be considered as exhibiting the Commentary exactly such as it came from the hands of Sáyana.

I shall proceed to give a list of those MSS. which I have made use of for this edition. I shall call the three classes, to which all the MSS. belong, A, B, and C, marking at the same time each particular MS. by its own number.

#### A.

A 2. A manuscript in four volumes, containing all the eight Ashtakas. It was presented by Colebrooke to the library of the East-India-House, where it is entered under Nos. 2133—2136. It contains also the text of the hymns, but not throughout. In some Ashtakas the accents also are marked. It is dated between 1747 and 1760<sup>n</sup>, and has been written by different hands at Benares. It is on the whole the most valuable MS., and the only one which represents this first class of MSS. throughout the whole of the Commentary, though in some of the later Ashtakas long passages are wanting in this MS. also.

For the first Ashtaka I have to include in this class—

A 1. An old MS. of the National Library at Paris, containing the first

<sup>n</sup> First Ashtaka :

शाके विष्णुपदागरागकुमि ते मासे नभस्याभिधे ।  
पक्षे मेचकसंज्ञके मुनिनिधौ वाचस्पतेर्वासरे ।  
श्रीनारायणदीक्षितानुवचनादेतन्मुदा पुस्तकं ।  
विश्वेशस्य पुरे बलीलिलखदलं श्रीशंकरप्रोतये ॥

This gives Śāka 1673, or 1751 A. D.

Fourth Ashtaka :

बालकृष्णश्रोत्रियेण स्वैरे संयोजितो मुदा ।  
मार्गशुक्लतयोदश्यां नंदांगमिंदुशाकके ॥

This gives Śāka 1669, or 1747 A. D.

Sixth Ashtaka : संवत् १८०६ = 1749 A. D.

Seventh Ashtaka : संवत् १८०९ वर्षे आश्विने मासे  
कृष्णपक्षे तृतीयायां तिथौ भौमवासरे लिखितमिदं पुस्तकं  
श्रीमन्नारायणदीक्षितपाठनकरोपनामेन स्वार्थं परार्थं च ॥  
This gives 1752 A. D.

Eighth Ashtaka : संवत् १८१७ माघमासे कृष्णपक्षे  
तयोदश्यां सोमवासरेऽयं ग्रंथः संपूर्णः । लिखितो राघ-  
कृष्णेन छात्रेण श्रीकाश्यां पुष्पान् ॥ This gives 1760  
A. D.

Ashtaka only. It is well written, and indeed gave me the first hope that a critical edition of Sāyaṇa might still be possible. It is dated Samvat 1625° (1682. A.D.), and is in many respects more useful than A 2. But, though of earlier date than A 2, it cannot be considered by any means as the original from which A 2. was copied: for although the omission of passages which stand in A 1. might be ascribed to the negligence of the transcriber of A 2, yet there are also whole lines which are left out in A 1, but which are not wanting in A 2. Both MSS. flow from one original source, and their authority is on the whole equal; though A 1, as being the earlier branch, has thereby some advantages over A 2. The absence of the other seven Ashtakas in A 1. is a great loss for an edition of the Commentary.

To the same class must also be referred A 3, the MS. of the first Ashtaka in Sir R. Chambers' collection, now in the Royal Library at Berlin. Of this old MS., which is in a very bad state of preservation, I possess no complete collation, but only short notes and extracts which I made before I had seen the MSS. at Paris and London, and before I was in a position to conceive the possibility of a critical edition of the Commentary. A comparison of several characteristic passages, however, shews the connection of this MS. with A 1. and A 2, with which it coincides in several of its right as well as of its wrong readings. As I was not able, however, to verify in each particular passage the reading of this MS., it is not to be understood as included in the general designation of class A, unless especially mentioned.

### B.

The second class, B, is represented by two MSS., both of them complete copies of the Commentary. I owe my first acquaintance with this class of MSS. to the kindness and liberality of Professor E. Burnouf, who allowed me, during my stay at Paris, to copy and collate the MS. of Sāyaṇa in his possession. Besides several passages which are corrected or supplied by this MS. in places where mistakes or omissions occur in A. or C, it contains also a number of passages which evidently bear the character of later additions: they stand frequently without any connection with the rest of the Commentary, and I had no doubt that they owed their origin to marginal notes which had been added by Brahmans while studying the Veda, and which in later copies had been

° विद्याशंकरचरणेभ्यो नमः ॥ संवत् १६२५ वर्षे चैत्र- पं - यदेवसुत पुरुषोत्तमलिखितं ॥ ॥ शुभं भवतु ॥ कल्याणं  
शुदि ७ गुरौ । अद्यह् श्रीसंभतीर्थवास्तव्य श्रीश्रीगौडज्ञातीय भूयात् ॥

incorporated into the text, though sometimes inserted in a wrong place. This supposition I found fully proved by another MS., which has lately been added to the library of the East-India-House, and which is evidently the very MS. from which Professor Burnouf's copy was taken. In this MS. all those spurious passages, which occur neither in A. nor C, have not yet been incorporated into the text, but appear still as marginal notes. Nay, it is even easy to see how, by mistaking the signs of reference, the transcriber was led to misplace some of these additions. I call the MS. of the East-India-House B 1, and that of Professor Burnouf B 2; though the latter is on the whole so carefully copied, that both may be considered as one MS.

## C.

The third class of MSS. is much more numerous represented, but consists almost entirely of modern copies, executed, with more or less care, for the use of European scholars. Yet this class of MSS. also was indispensable for restoring a complete and correct text of Sáyana: for though omissions and mistakes are very frequent, yet some difficult passages are given more correctly in this class of MSS. than in either A. or B; while others, which are partly omitted in A. or B, receive occasionally great help from a comparison of C. Modern additions occur, but very seldom, and their late origin is so evident that they cannot be mistaken. The following is a list of this last class of MSS.

C 1. A complete copy of the Commentary in the National Library at Paris. It is advantageously distinguished from the rest, in so far as some very considerable omissions common to all the C. MSS. have been supplied in C 1. from another MS. Yet there can be no doubt that, with these exceptions, all the rest of this MS. descends from the same original source as the other C. MSS. There is, for instance, a long omission at the end of the fourth Adhyāya of the first Ashtaka: all the C. MSS. break off in the third verse of the twenty-fifth Varga (p. 534 of my edition), with the words दासीभावादि, so that twenty pages are altogether wanting. It is difficult to account for this omission, and I suppose this loss to have happened very early, because in A. and B. also, where the Commentary goes on to the end of the fourth Adhyāya, there is a peculiarity in the style of the Commentator not quite in accordance with the rest of his work. That this omission has been supplied in C 1. from a different MS. is evident, and can be traced even in the smallest particulars. Thus, for instance, throughout the whole of this supplement the merely grammatical part of the

Commentary is always divided by « » from the rest, while in all the rest of this MS. the beginning of the grammatical explanations is not marked at all.

C 1 b. A second MS. of the National Library at Paris, comprehending the first Ashtaka only, and very negligently written.

C 2. The next MS. of this class is a copy which Dr. Mill brought over from India, and which he kindly lent me for my edition. It will hereafter be deposited in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, for which the whole collection of Dr. Mill's Sanskrit MSS. has been lately purchased. It contains all the eight Ashtakas complete, with the usual omissions of the C. MSS., and is written very carefully and distinctly.

C 3. One volume, containing the first Ashtaka only. It belonged formerly to the Sanskrit College at Calcutta, afterwards to Professor Wilson, and is now deposited in the Bodleian Library.

C 4. A complete copy of Sáyana's Commentary, forming Nos. 78—86. in Professor Wilson's collection of Sanskrit MSS. in the Bodleian Library. It is dated Samvat 1890 = 1833 A. D.

C 5. Another copy belonging to the same collection, and entered in the Catalogue under Nos. 57—60. It comprehends the first, third, and fourth Ashtakas only; the second being supplied by another MS., No. 74, which contains six only out of the eight Adhyáyas.

C 6. A Bengali MS., containing the text and commentary of the first two Adhyáyas of the first Ashtaka. This likewise forms part of Professor Wilson's collection, and is entered in the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library under No. 75.

That all these MSS. must be considered as separated from the MSS. of Sáyana himself by at least one degree, I conclude from the existence of such mistakes as are common to all the three classes of our MSS. I do not mean to say that Sáyana may not himself have committed mistakes in writing his commentary. On the contrary, there are mistakes in all the MSS. which most probably rest upon Sáyana's own responsibility. For instance, Rv. 1. 114, 4, the grammatical explanation of दुरेवै: evidently contains a mistake: yet all the MSS. quote the same Sûtra of Páṇini (III. 3, 126), and there can be little doubt that Sáyana himself is the author of this wrong quotation<sup>p</sup>. If mistakes of this

<sup>p</sup> Instead of दुरुपसृष्टादेतेरीषद्भुःसुध्विति खलु, Sáyana ought to have written इण् गतौ । इण्शीङ्भ्यां वन्निति भावे वन्प्रत्ययः । निन्नादाद्युदात्तत्वं । बहुव्रीहौ गति-कारकोपपदादितुत्तरपदप्रकृतिस्वरत्वं ॥

kind occur only in one class of MSS., or in two, but not in all three at the same time, it must frequently remain uncertain whether they are to be laid to the charge of Śāyana or his transcribers. For instance, Rv. I, 97, 3. A. has संज्ञापूर्वकस्य विधेरनित्यत्वादृष्टभावः, while B. and C. read आगमानुशासनस्यानित्यत्वादृष्टभावः. Śāyana might have written both, but I have retained the reading of A, as, in cases like this, A. generally represents the more authentic reading, B. and C. being more liable to corrections. Rv. I, 102, 3, however, I have adopted the reading of B. and C, सप्तम्या ङदेशः, instead of विभक्तेराकारः (A 2), because, as A 1. coincides here with B. and C, the reading of A 2. can only be considered as resting upon the authority of the transcriber of A 2, and not upon the collective authority of A. Sometimes old mistakes have been corrected in the more modern MSS. Rv. I, 66, 3, A. and C. read समानं माद्यंतस्मिन्निति समदः संग्रामाः, while in B. the grammatical fault, अस्मिन्, has been corrected into रघु. Though अस्मिन् may have originated with Śāyana himself, I have of course adopted the reading of B. I shall now quote, however, some passages where mistakes common to all the MSS. cannot be ascribed to the author, but must have crept into the MSS. before any of our present copies were written. There are evident traces of corruption in the text of the Commentary in explaining the grammatical formation of भूना, Rv. I, 110, 2. All the MSS. omit इतीकारलोपो, but have yet the च after भूभावः, which leaves no doubt that इतीकारलोपो must have preceded it. Again, Rv. I, 115, 5, where अभिचक्षे is explained, the MSS. have only अभिमुख्येन, which explains merely the first part of अभिचक्षे, and necessarily requires the addition of either द्रुं or दर्शनाय, or some similar word, to explain the second part. This, however, is omitted in all the MSS., and I was obliged to supply it by conjecture. There is one passage towards the end of the first Aṣṭaka (Rv. I, 120, 7.) where the omission of several letters is marked in the A. as well as in the C. MSS., and where the B. MSS. also, though they do not mark the omission, are of no use for restoring the text. In this case I was unable to fill out this omission, and I have marked it in the same way as the MSS. do<sup>1</sup>. Sometimes old omissions have been supplied by the transcribers, but not always successfully. Rv. I, 99, 1. all the MSS. in explaining अरातीयतः read इति शस उदाहृतं, thus making अरातीयतः an accusative plural, while it ought to be the genitive singular, and therefore इति इस

<sup>1</sup> There is probably also a corruption in remain uncertain till new MSS. can be pro-  
the words कंचनास्तं which precede the lacuna. cured.  
One might conjecture कचनान्तं, but this must

उदात्तं. That शस is indeed nothing but a conjecture of the copyists, becomes clear when we see that A 2. has इति - उदात्तं, thus marking an old omission in the original MS. from which it was copied, without any attempt to correct it. Such blanks occur most frequently in A 2, and in some cases evidently because the MS. from which it was copied was worn off at the margin, so that the blanks return always at regular intervals, that is to say, always at the end of a line of the original MS. Yet although in many other respects too, the A. MSS. exhibit the best authenticated reading, yet it is impossible to consider either B. or C. as descending from A, on account of the omissions, additions, and mistakes which are peculiar to each of the three classes of MSS., and have never found their way from one class into another. What I had to do therefore as an editor was first to find, by a collation of the different copies of each class of MSS., the reading of each of the three principal classes, and afterwards to choose that reading which, by weighing the authority of the three classes, and by taking into account the whole style of Śāyana, seemed to be the most authentic. Considering, however, that this edition of the Commentary is not only a critical work, but at the same time destined to be useful for studying the Veda, I have never carried these critical principles so far as to leave a corruption in the text, which, though it might rest upon the authority of the best MSS., was still so evident, that any body, if acquainted with the rules of the Sanskrit language, would have seen it, and, if conversant with the style of Śāyana, would have safely corrected it. I have even added some few passages, which, though they belonged only to one class of MSS., B. or C<sup>r</sup>, yet seemed to be useful where

<sup>r</sup> Rv. I, I, 1. (p. 44.) the quotation तथा च यज्जते etc., on the change of इ into ऊ, belongs only to the B. MSS., yet I have not suppressed it, as it seemed to be useful. Dr. E. Röer, who had begun an edition of Śāyana's Commentary in Calcutta, (the first two Lectures of the Sanhitā of the Rig-veda, in the Bibliotheca Indica, fasciculus 1-4. Calcutta, 1848,) but who, on hearing of my edition, has kindly given up his own plan, and published instead his excellent edition of the Vrihadāraṇyaka, has left out this passage, either because B. MSS. were not procurable at Calcutta, or because he followed different

principles of criticism in his edition. Again, Rv. I, 23, 1. the explanation of तीव्राः occurs only in the C. MSS., and it is evident, from the quotation of the Manoramā, that this passage could not come from the hands of Śāyana: yet I thought it necessary not to suppress it on account of the accent. If तीव्राः were formed after Up. S. II. 29, we should expect it to be a paroxytone; but it is formed by रक्, and not by रन्, in the same way as वृत्रः and भद्रः, which are also oxytones. Dr. Röer gives the explanation of तीव्राः, but with some slight differences, which must be peculiar to his own MSS.

they stood. So that I may safely assert, that whatever good was to be found in the MSS. will be found in this edition, while much that was faulty in them has been corrected.

The laws of Sandhi and other euphonic laws I have endeavoured to observe in the same way as they have been practically carried out in the best Sanskrit MSS., considering it necessary, in a work like that of Sáyana, to avoid the innovations of European, as well as the antiquated subtleties of Indian grammarians. I have also followed the custom of the MSS., which sometimes suspend very properly the laws of Sandhi in order to avoid certain combinations of words, by which either single words or the structure of whole sentences might become obscure and doubtful. In this manner the Sandhi becomes for the Sanskrit what punctuation is for other languages, only it is as difficult to lay down general laws for the one as for the other.

I have now only to mention those works which I made use of for verifying the quotations in Sáyana's Commentary. There is first of all Páṇini, whose grammatical rules are most frequently quoted by Sáyana, sometimes at full length, sometimes only with a few words by way of reference<sup>s</sup>. I have derived great advantage for verifying and understanding these technical rules from Professor Böhtlingk's edition of Páṇini, which, whatever may be said against some parts of it, is a most excellent and meritorious work. In the quotation of

<sup>s</sup> I must mention here one expression of Sáyana's, which occurs very frequently, but has given rise to doubts, and is, as it seems, not yet understood rightly. There are two rules of Páṇini's, consisting of the words **आमन्त्रितस्य च**; the one (VI. 1, 198.) teaches that a vocative case has the accent on the first syllable; the other (VIII. 1. 19.) restricts this rule, by saying that if a vocative be preceded by another word, and do not stand at the beginning of a Páda, it has no accent at all. In order to distinguish between these two rules, Sáyana calls the accent prescribed by the former rule, which occurs in the sixth Ashtaka, **षाष्टिकमाद्युदात्तत्वं**; while the suppression of the accent, as prescribed by the latter rule in the eighth Ashtaka, is called by him **आष्टमिको निघातः** or **आष्टमिकं**

**सवानुदात्तत्वं**;—**षाष्टिक** and **आष्टमिक** can therefore, as far as I can see, have no other meaning than "occurring in the sixth and occurring in the eighth Ashtaka:" yet I find that, for some reason or other, Dr. Weber (in his edition of the Vájasaneyi-sanhitá, p. 7. lin. 6.) quotes Pán. VI. 1, 198. as the reference to **आमन्त्रितस्य च**, where the effect of this rule is distinctly said to be **आष्टमिको निघातः**. Sáyana uses also **चातुर्थिकः** in the same sense, as applied to a rule occurring in the fourth Ashtaka of Páṇini: cf. Rv. 1, 84, 14, where the rule intended by the Commentator is in fact to be found in the fourth Ashtaka of Páṇini, IV. 2, 86; so that I have no doubt that Dr. Weber's quotation is to be considered as a misprint.



rules I have seldom had occasion to differ from his edition, and where I have done so, it has only been after mature consideration. In the quotation of the Vārttikas also I have followed Professor Böhtlingk's edition, though it is to be regretted that he has left out many of them. These, however, could easily be found in the Calcutta edition of Pāṇini, though for some of them I was obliged to have recourse to the Mahābhāṣya. In order to make this edition more useful, I have been induced to add the references from Pāṇini in the first Adhyāyas, but afterwards I have done so only whenever a new rule was quoted for the first time. Professor Böhtlingk (now Counsellor of State to His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Russia) could not render a more valuable service to Sanskrit philology, than by publishing a second and complete edition of Pāṇini and his Commentaries, a work for which he must possess at present the most ample materials.

Two other collections of grammatical Sūtras which are quoted by Sāyaṇa are the Uṇādi-sūtras and the Phīṭ-sūtras of Śāntanāchārya. Both of them form part of the Siddhānta-kaumudī, as published at Calcutta, 1811, but they have been edited with much less care than Pāṇini's Sūtras. They have been reprinted in the Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg, 1843 and 1844, by Professor Böhtlingk, but require, particularly the Uṇādi-sūtras, a careful collation of MSS. and the help of commentaries. I have quoted the Sūtras after Professor Böhtlingk's text, as being more accessible than the edition of the Siddhānta-kaumudī; but I have been continually obliged to have recourse to the MSS. and Commentaries of the Uṇādi-sūtras<sup>t</sup>.

A fourth grammatical work quoted by Sāyaṇa is the Dhātupāṭha. Of this work we have a most excellent edition by Professor Westergaard of Copenhagen, at the end of his Radices Linguae Sanscritae. I have quoted it only a few times, as it is very easy to find Sāyaṇa's quotations with the help of Prof.

<sup>t</sup> The MS. from which I have derived the greatest use is the Uṇādivṛtti, by Ujjvala-datta, a work which has been composed after a careful collation of old MSS. and Commentaries. It frequently points out words and Sūtras as being of later origin, and as not occurring in old Commentaries. In our printed editions some Sūtras are left out, others mixed with the Commentary; some

are incomplete, others incorrect; and the meaning and formation of words are frequently mistaken. I merely mention this here to point out how unsafe it would be to make use of our present editions for lexicographic purposes; but I shall soon have an opportunity of returning to this subject, when examining the historical value of this and other works previous to Pāṇini.

Westergaard's Radices. Sáyana has himself written a Commentary on the Dhátupátha, before he wrote his Commentary on the Veda, and has frequently readings peculiar to himself, which he has defended in his Commentary<sup>u</sup>, and which Prof. Westergaard also has generally mentioned in his edition.

Another work frequently used by Sáyana for explaining the Veda is Yáska's Nirukta. This work existed only in manuscript when I began to print Sáyana's Commentary; and as the greater part of the Nirukta is contained in Sáyana's works, I was obliged to copy and analyse it, in order to verify Sáyana's quotations. For though, with the help of the Sarvánukrama, all the passages from the Veda which are explained by Yáska may be traced back to their places in the text by referring to the Commentary on the Nirukta, where the Devatá and Rishi of each passage are given, yet it is very difficult, *vice versa*, to find always the place in the Nirukta where a passage of the Veda has been explained by Yáska; still more so when only a few words out of Yáska's explanations are quoted by Sáyana. In the course of carrying this first volume through the press, a very correct edition of the Nirukta has been published by my learned friend Professor Roth in Germany. Prof. Roth had kindly informed me beforehand which of the two recensions of the Nirukta he would follow in his edition, and I am glad to find that consequently the references which I have always given, when the Nirukta is quoted by Sáyana, coincide with his edition. In some few places Sáyana's quotations from Yáska do not exactly correspond with the text of the Nirukta; but this is probably owing to Sáyana's manner of quoting, which, as I have mentioned before, is generally done from memory. Although these differences were very slight, yet I could not, in accordance with the principles of my edition, take it upon myself to correct them. I have not added references to Sáyana's quotations from the Nighaṇṭus, because these lists of Vaidik words are already arranged systematically under different heads, and thus require no further reference.

The same applies to Sáyana's quotations from Kátyáyana's Sarvánukrama. I have myself compared every passage quoted from this Index of the authors, deities, metres, etc. of each hymn. But as this Index follows exactly the same order as the hymns of the Rig-veda, it would have been useless to add the references. In those cases also where Sáyana quotes from the Sarvánukrama

<sup>u</sup> Sáyana quotes his Dhátuvṛtti, Rv. I, 42, 7. I, 51, 8. I, 82, 1. etc.

certain rules on metre and other subjects contained in the Paribhāshā, I have abstained from giving the references, because this Introduction to Kātyāyana's Sarvānukrama is likewise so well arranged, and so short, that it is as easy to find a reference as to find the quotation itself.

Another author whom Śāyana quotes most frequently with regard to the Vaidik ceremonial is Āśvalāyana. There are twelve books of Śrauta-sūtras, and four books of Gṛihya-sūtras, none of them as yet published. Śāyana quotes these Sūtras continually, whenever a hymn or part of a hymn of the Rig-veda occurs which is to be employed by the Hotṛi-priests at a certain act of a sacrifice. Now if, like the Sūtras to the Yajur-veda, the Sūtras of Āśvalāyana followed the same order as the hymns, it would not have been difficult to find Śāyana's quotations in the MSS. of Āśvalāyana's Sūtras, and it would scarcely have been necessary to give a reference to each of Śāyana's quotations from Āśvalāyana. But the Rig-veda has preserved its old arrangement and its genuine form, and has not been supplanted by a Hotṛi-veda, or a prayer-book for the Hotṛi-priests; such as the Yajur-veda is for the Adhvaryu-priests, and the Sāma-veda for the Udgātri-priests. If, like these two so-called ceremonial Vedas, the Rig-veda also consisted only of such passages as are requisite for the Brahmanic sacrifices, arranged in the same order as they have to be recited by the Hotṛi-priests at different ceremonies, the order of the hymns and of the Sūtras, and probably also of the Brāhmaṇas, would be the same. But, as it is, the Rig-veda represents to us the old collection of sacred poetry, as it has been handed down by tradition in different Vaidik families, each of which claimed a certain number of ancient poets (Rishis) as their own. The poems therefore which have been incorporated in the Rig-veda-sanhitā are arranged according to the old families to which the poets of certain songs are said to have belonged, and consequently those passages which in later times were selected as most appropriate to be employed at the grand sacrifices by the Hotṛi-priests, are found scattered about in different parts of this old collection. Śāyana, who of course knew Āśvalāyana's Sūtras by heart, quotes these Sūtras whenever one of those verses occurs which Āśvalāyana has prescribed for any one of the different sacrifices. But all that Śāyana adds, to enable one who has not learnt by heart these sixteen books of ceremonial Sūtras, to find their place in Āśvalāyana, consists in mentioning the name of the particular part of the ceremonial, and sometimes in giving the beginning of the chapter where a certain Sūtra

occurs. By the help of Indices, however, I have succeeded in verifying these passages also, and I have always added the book and chapter where Śāyana's quotations are to be found in Āśvalāyana's work. If, in the passages which Śāyana quotes from the Brāhmaṇas, he had restricted himself to the Brāhmaṇas of the Rig-veda, I should have added references to these quotations also. But as Śāyana takes his quotations promiscuously from all the Brāhmaṇas, whether connected with the Rig-veda or the Sāma-veda, Yajur-veda, and Atharva-veda, I determined rather to give no references whatever for these Brāhmaṇa passages than to do it incompletely\*. Besides there was the difficulty that these Brāhmaṇas and Āraṇyakas, which as yet exist only in manuscript, are not always divided in the same manner; so that if I had adapted my references to the MSS., they might perhaps not have been found in accordance with the editions of several of the Brāhmaṇas which are now preparing for publication. In many instances I have derived great help from the original MSS. of the Brāhmaṇas, particularly as Śāyana's quotations from these works are generally full of mistakes, arising from old Vaidik forms, which the transcribers did not

\* It is not only on account of the vastness of the Brāhmaṇa literature that I found it impossible to verify every quotation, but there are many Brāhmaṇas of which there are not even MSS. to be procured in any of the European libraries. Some seem lost even in India, and are only known by name. With regard to the Brāhmaṇas of the Sāma-veda, I had stated, in a letter to my friend Professor Benfey at Göttingen, that there are eight. Prof. Benfey has kindly mentioned this in the Preface to his edition of the Sāma-veda; and as Dr. Weber has lately published some observations with regard to Prof. Benfey's and Mr. Colebrooke's statements on the Brāhmaṇa literature of the Sāma-veda, I owe it to Prof. Benfey and to myself to make good my assertion. Śāyana, in his Commentary on the Sāmavidhāna-Brāhmaṇa, says:

अष्टौ हि ब्राह्मणग्रंथाः प्रौढं ब्राह्मणमादिभं ।  
षड्विंशत्यं द्वितीयं स्यान्नतः सामविधिर्भवेत् ॥  
आर्यं देवताध्यायं भवेदुपनिषत्ततः ।  
संहितोपनिषद्ग्रंथो ग्रंथा अष्टावितीरिताः ॥

तत्र महाषड्विंशत्ययोर्ग्रंथयोर्वैज्ञाधिकारिणां स्वर्गादिफल-  
प्राप्तय एकाहाहीनसत्तात्मका महाकृतवः प्रतिपादिताः ।  
अथ सामविधानाख्ये तृतीये ब्राह्मणग्रंथे etc.

“There are eight Brāhmaṇas; the Praudha is the first Brāhmaṇa, (this means the large Brāhmaṇa, the Pañcaviṁśa, not proḍha as Dr. W. writes); the one called Shaḍviṁśa or Shaḍviṁśad-Brāhmaṇa is the second; then follows the Sāmavidhi; then the Ārsheya-Brāhmaṇa, the Devatādhyaṇya-Brāhmaṇa, and the Upanishat. These with the Sanhitopanishad and the Vāṁśa are called the eight books. In the great Brāhmaṇa and the Shaḍviṁśa the principal sacrifices, the Ekāha, Ahina, and Satras, have been taught by which persons, fit for offering sacrifices, may obtain life in heaven and other rewards. Now, in the third Brāhmaṇa, called Sāmavidhāna, other hymns will be enjoined, etc.” This, I hope, will be sufficient to vindicate my assertion; for nothing is more likely to bring Vaidik studies into discredit than mere assertions and ingenious conjectures, of which I am sorry to say we have had already a great number even in print.

know and understand. Frequently, however, I found also that real differences existed between a passage as quoted by Śāyaṇa and the text as exhibited in the Brāhmaṇas, which can only be accounted for by the supposition that Śāyaṇa used some Brāhmaṇas in a Śākhā different from that which was accessible to me in manuscript.

I have only to express, in conclusion, my sincere thanks for the instruction, the advice, the encouragement, and assistance which I have received, in the course of my studies, from those distinguished Oriental scholars whose lectures I have followed at the Universities of Leipzig, Berlin, and Paris, as well as from those whom I met with there, and with whom I became connected by the ties of kindred pursuits and friendship. To mention the liberality with which foreigners are admitted to the rich collections of the National Library at Paris, the Library of the East-India-House in London, and the Bodleian Library at Oxford, would only be repeating what is known to all who have had occasion to consult these Libraries. Yet this ought not to prevent me from acknowledging the personal obligation under which I feel myself towards M. Hase, M. Reinaud and M. Munk at the National Library at Paris, and towards the Rev. Dr. Bandinel and the Rev. H. O. Coxe at the Bodleian Library at Oxford, for the kindness which I have received at their hands during my studies at Paris and Oxford. Private collections also of Sanskrit MSS. have been freely thrown open to me, in France by Professor Burnouf, in England by the Rev. Dr. Mill; and I avail myself of this opportunity to return my thanks to both of these eminent Oriental scholars. I have also thankfully to acknowledge the kind assistance of my learned friend Dr. Ch. Rieu at the British Museum, by whose careful corrections many misprints and mistakes have been removed, which, notwithstanding the great accuracy and ability of the compositor employed on the present volume, could scarcely be avoided in so extensive a work. Above all, however, my thanks are due to Professor H. H. Wilson. It would be presumptuous on my part were I to speak of his unequalled achievements in different branches of Oriental philology. But it would be ungrateful were I not to acknowledge the kindness with which he has assisted me in my undertaking. To his recommendation I owe the liberal patronage which the Honourable the Court of Directors of the East-India-Company have bestowed upon this work, and without which its publication would scarcely have been possible. While I was preparing this edition his books and manuscripts were at

my disposal; whenever I wanted advice, he was ready to give it; and he has even given his valuable time to correct the press. The English translation of the Rig-veda by Professor Wilson, which is soon to appear, will be a new proof of the interest which he has taken in this work. To have been allowed to enjoy his acquaintance, and to avail myself of his instruction, will always be to me the best compensation for what I have lost in living so long away from my own country and my old friends.

M. M.

OXFORD,  
*October 1849.*



# P R E F A C E.

THE principles followed in the first volume in editing the hymns of the Rig-veda, and in restoring the text of Sáyana's Commentary, have been strictly adhered to in the second. My own conviction and the approval of those best competent to judge have not allowed me to adopt a different course, although others have thought Sáyana's Commentary undeserving a critical edition, and the time that has been expended on it. Yet, perhaps, neither the age nor the country of an author can justly be pleaded as an excuse for disregarding those rules of critical scholarship which in classical philology have been ratified by the experience of the last three centuries; and though I feel obliged to apologize for the consequent delay in the publication of this second volume, I should be more sorry if I had now to publish it without the conviction that all sources available for the restoration of the text had been fully exhausted.

The MSS. of the Sanhitá and Pada-text of the hymns have been the same for the second as for the first volume, and therefore require no further notice.

The case differs with the MSS. of Sáyana's Commentary. For the first Ashtaka I was able almost always to determine the original reading of each of the three families of MSS. by a comparison of the different members belonging to each; and it was found that in all important passages the readings of the three families, A., B., and C., could be so easily balanced that it rarely remained doubtful which of the three had to give way before the others. On this account it seemed to me unnecessary to publish the *varietas lectionis* for the first Ashtaka; and, with the exception of a few inaccuracies which really seem to be unavoidable in the course of editing so voluminous a work, I have not met, in the many excellent reviews of this edition of the Rig-veda, with any remarks which could on this point have changed my opinion.



In the second Ashtaka, however, this course could be no longer followed. When I began the printing of the second Ashtaka, to represent the A. class I had only one MS. instead of three, and this again was defective to such an extent that it could hardly be used for more than half of the second book. The MSS. of the B. class were the same as for the first Ashtaka; and I had even received a new copy from Bombay, which I call B 3. This, however, proved of little use, as it was but a new transcript of the same original from which Professor Burnouf's MS. had been taken. It could not have been copied from B 1, because this MS. was already in my hands when the new copy was made in India. There can be no doubt, however, that it was copied from a copy of B 1. Most likely the Pandit who parted with his old MS. (B 1.) had a transcript made before he sold the original, and this transcript was copied in B 3. With regard to the C. MSS. it will be seen that three only out of the seven contain the second Ashtaka complete.

Under these circumstances it became impossible to determine with certainty the original reading of each of the three families; nay, for many passages the text of one or even two families was lost beyond recovery. Besides, almost all the MSS. of the second and the following Ashtakas seem to have been less frequently studied in India, and therefore less carefully corrected, than the first Ashtaka. The principal difficulty, however, arose from the defective state of A 2, because the text of the A. class is throughout the whole commentary by far the most authentic, and had been the principal authority for my edition. Before the first Ashtaka was finished I had therefore written to India to obtain a new MS. for the second. After waiting, however, for a considerable time, I received the news that the MS. which Dr. Roer had procured for me at Calcutta had been lost by shipwreck. Not wishing to retard the publication of the second volume still longer, I began to print with the MSS. then at hand. Most fortunately, in the course of carrying the second Ashtaka through the press, a new MS. was forwarded from India by Dr. Ballantyne, the distinguished Principal of the Sanskrit College at Benares. It was sent to Professor Wilson, and he most kindly presented it to me. It is a complete copy of Sáyana's Commentary, and, as far as I know, the most ancient MS. of this author in Europe. The first Ashtaka contains 648 leaves, but has no date. The second has 260, the third 398, the fourth 312 leaves. At the end of this Ashtaka the following date is given: ॥ संवत् १६ ज्येष्ठवदि प ५ वे १ संवत् आषाढा २९ वर्षे ॥ This is Samvat

1624 or A. D. 1681. The fifth Ashtaka has 237, the ~~sixth~~ 264 leaves, the last containing again a date; संवत् १६२३ वर्षे ज्येष्ठमासे शुक्लपक्षे पूर्णिमास्या पून्यतथौ गुरुवनेः । This is therefore a year earlier, 1623 Samvat, or 1680 A. D. In the seventh Ashtaka, which contains 274, and in the eighth, which contains 322 leaves, the last leaves on which the date is usually marked, are lost. We may therefore ascribe this copy to the years 1680 and 1681. The oldest MS. which I had used before was that of the first Ashtaka at the National Library in Paris (A 1.), which bears the date Samvat 1625, or 1682 A. D. Colebrooke's MS. (A 2.) was dated between 1747 and 1760 A. D.; and fragments of the Commentary to the first Ashtaka at the Royal Library in Berlin (A 3.) exhibit their date as Samvat 1664 and 1665, which is 1721-1722 A. D. As all the other MSS. of Sáyana's Commentary are still more modern, this last arrived MS., now in my possession, is therefore the oldest in Europe.

But though it is the oldest MS., it does not, as I expected, belong to the A. class. On comparing it with the other MSS. I found that it belongs to class C., and may in fact be considered as the prototype of all the C. MSS. This would by itself have made this copy extremely valuable. Its value, however, was further increased when I found that in the second Ashtaka considerable portions had been most carefully compared and corrected after a MS. belonging to the A. class. If it had not been for the modern date of Colebrooke's copy, I should have said that the collation had been taken from this very MS. (A 2.) As it is, we must suppose that the Benares MS. was collated with an older A. MS., whence afterwards Colebrooke's copy was taken. As these collations and corrections, which are very numerous, were made in the usual Indian manner, by covering the original text with yellow orpiment and writing the various reading over it, or on the margin, it was possible in many cases to use this MS. as an authority not only for the C. but also for the A. class; a discovery which makes this MS. invaluable, particularly for the second Ashtaka, where the text of the A. MSS. was frequently lost altogether. As to the C. MSS. they are all, though not immediately, derived from this copy, but *before* it had been corrected by a collation with an A. MS. This can be proved from accidental mistakes and indistinct corrections which occur in this MS., and have afterwards found their way into all the C. MSS. I suppose therefore that this (my own MS. from Benares) had been repeatedly transcribed there before it was collated with an A. MS.; that one of these transcripts was brought to Calcutta, and

In the second Ashtaka, however, this course could be no longer followed. When I began the printing of the second Ashtaka, to represent the A. class I had only one MS. instead of three, and this again was defective to such an extent that it could hardly be used for more than half of the second book. The MSS. of the B. class were the same as for the first Ashtaka; and I had even received a new copy from Bombay, which I call B 3. This, however, proved of little use, as it was but a new transcript of the same original from which Professor Burnouf's MS. had been taken. It could not have been copied from B 1, because this MS. was already in my hands when the new copy was made in India. There can be no doubt, however, that it was copied from a copy of B 1. Most likely the Pandit who parted with his old MS. (B 1.) had a transcript made before he sold the original, and this transcript was copied in B 3. With regard to the C. MSS. it will be seen that three only out of the seven contain the second Ashtaka complete.

Under these circumstances it became impossible to determine with certainty the original reading of each of the three families; nay, for many passages the text of one or even two families was lost beyond recovery. Besides, almost all the MSS. of the second and the following Ashtakas seem to have been less frequently studied in India, and therefore less carefully corrected, than the first Ashtaka. The principal difficulty, however, arose from the defective state of A 2, because the text of the A. class is throughout the whole commentary by far the most authentic, and had been the principal authority for my edition. Before the first Ashtaka was finished I had therefore written to India to obtain a new MS. for the second. After waiting, however, for a considerable time, I received the news that the MS. which Dr. Roer had procured for me at Calcutta had been lost by shipwreck. Not wishing to retard the publication of the second volume still longer, I began to print with the MSS. then at hand. Most fortunately, in the course of carrying the second Ashtaka through the press, a new MS. was forwarded from India by Dr. Ballantyne, the distinguished Principal of the Sanskrit College at Benares. It was sent to Professor Wilson, and he most kindly presented it to me. It is a complete copy of Sáyana's Commentary, and, as far as I know, the most ancient MS. of this author in Europe. The first Ashtaka contains 648 leaves, but has no date. The second has 260, the third 398, the fourth 312 leaves. At the end of this Ashtaka the following date is given : ॥ संवत् १६ ज्येष्ठदि प ३ वे १ संवत् आषाढा २५ वर्षे ॥ This is Samvat

1624 or A. D. 1681. The fifth Ashtaka has 237, the sixth 264 leaves, the last containing again a date; संवत् १६२३ वर्षे ज्येष्ठमासे शुक्लपक्षे पूर्णिमास्या पून्यतथौ गुरुवनेः । This is therefore a year earlier, 1623 Samvat, or 1680 A. D. In the seventh Ashtaka, which contains 274, and in the eighth, which contains 322 leaves, the last leaves on which the date is usually marked, are lost. We may therefore ascribe this copy to the years 1680 and 1681. The oldest MS. which I had used before was that of the first Ashtaka at the National Library in Paris (A 1.), which bears the date Samvat 1625, or 1682 A. D. Colebrooke's MS. (A 2.) was dated between 1747 and 1760 A. D.; and fragments of the Commentary to the first Ashtaka at the Royal Library in Berlin (A 3.) exhibit their date as Samvat 1664 and 1665, which is 1721-1722 A. D. As all the other MSS. of Sáyana's Commentary are still more modern, this last arrived MS., now in my possession, is therefore the oldest in Europe.

But though it is the oldest MS., it does not, as I expected, belong to the A. class. On comparing it with the other MSS. I found that it belongs to class C., and may in fact be considered as the prototype of all the C. MSS. This would by itself have made this copy extremely valuable. Its value, however, was further increased when I found that in the second Ashtaka considerable portions had been most carefully compared and corrected after a MS. belonging to the A. class. If it had not been for the modern date of Colebrooke's copy, I should have said that the collation had been taken from this very MS. (A 2.) As it is, we must suppose that the Benares MS. was collated with an older A. MS., whence afterwards Colebrooke's copy was taken. As these collations and corrections, which are very numerous, were made in the usual Indian manner, by covering the original text with yellow orpiment and writing the various reading over it, or on the margin, it was possible in many cases to use this MS. as an authority not only for the C. but also for the A. class; a discovery which makes this MS. invaluable, particularly for the second Ashtaka, where the text of the A. MSS. was frequently lost altogether. As to the C. MSS. they are all, though not immediately, derived from this copy, but *before* it had been corrected by a collation with an A. MS. This can be proved from accidental mistakes and indistinct corrections which occur in this MS., and have afterwards found their way into all the C. MSS. I suppose therefore that this (my own MS. from Benares) had been repeatedly transcribed there before it was collated with an A. MS.; that one of these transcripts was brought to Calcutta, and

that from it most, if not all, of the C. MSS. were taken at Calcutta. Certain it is that C 1, C 2, and C 3. came from Calcutta, and large portions, which were copied for me from a MS. belonging to the Asiatic Society in Calcutta, contain literally the same text as the other C. MSS. There are readings, however, which are peculiar to the C. copies, and which do not occur in my Benares MS. Some are found in one or two of the C. copies only. These are either accidental mistakes, or occasional conjectures, which, after finding their way into one copy, were afterwards repeated by successive transcribers. They are useful as indicating the exact relationship of some of the C. MSS., but they can never claim any diplomatic authority. There is another class of various readings which run through all the C. MSS., but which have no guarantee in the old Benares C. They deserve a more careful consideration, for they are evidently old errors, or possibly old corrections. In passages where the C.'s agree among themselves, but differ from the Benares C., this generally agrees with A. These C. readings therefore, as they do not proceed from the Benares C., are in reality only later alterations of the original A. text. Though I have hardly ever adopted the readings of the C.'s, where they differ from the A.'s and the Benares C., I have inserted them in the *varietas lectionis*, because occasionally they seem to contain useful conjectures. Thus Rv. II. 6, 4. (page 445. line 10.) Ca. has प्रेरका वा; the same mistake occurs in A., while all the C.'s have the correct reading प्रेरको वा. It also happens, as has been shown in the Preface to the first volume, that passages originally wanting in the C. family have been supplied from other sources. In this manner C. and A. readings have been mixed up together in one and the same copy, particularly in Dr. Mill's, so as to cause considerable confusion in some parts of Sáyana's work. In later portions of the Commentary some of the C.'s cease to be C.'s, and become A.'s, owing to the writer having changed the original from which he copied.

By this new MS., which in its original text I count with the C., in its corrections with the A. MSS., while if it has to be quoted by itself, it will be marked Ca., the *apparatus criticus* became much simplified. The various readings of the C. MSS. have no longer any authority by themselves, but only so far as they agree with the original C. *before* it was collated. The text of the A. MSS. is supplied by Ca., where the A.'s are wanting, and confirmed where they and the corrections in Ca. agree.

It might be asked, why, if the A. MSS. agree with the corrected text of Ca.,

the whole family of the A.'s should not rather be considered as branching off from Ca., *after* the general text of the C. family was corrected as we find it in Ca.? and why the alterations in Ca. should not be taken for independent corrections made by the writer of Ca., instead of being gleaned from a collation with an A. MS.? On all important points the A. MSS. agree with the corrected Ca.; and on minor points it is impossible to deny that slight differences could as well be ascribed to the several copyists of the A. MSS. There are passages, however, which make it impossible to entertain this supposition: Rv. II. 9, 3. for instance, उदीरिष in Ca. has been corrected into उदारिष. Here the C. MSS. have उदीरिष, because they were copied from Ca. before it was corrected. But A. also has उदीरिष. This by itself might be a mistake of the copyist of A.; but this peculiar mistake is not likely to have happened if A. had been copied from Ca., where this very mistake had already been very distinctly emended. I have selected this passage for another purpose also. It shows that occasionally corrections are made in Ca. which cannot be traced back to A. They generally refer to such palpable errors, as for instance उदीरिष instead of उदारिष; and in these cases it is clear that the intelligent writer of Ca. was guided by his own judgment without looking to the authority of any MS. In order to prove that A. was copied from Ca., it would be necessary to point out passages where corrections in Ca. had been misread by the writer of A. This happens not unfrequently with the C. MSS. Alterations made by the original writer of Ca. were mistaken by the later copyists, and these mistakes are occasionally of such a character that they could only have happened with the very leaf of Ca. before the eyes of the copyist. Now I have not been able to find any evidence of this kind against the A. MSS. Quite at the beginning of the second Ashṭaka, for instance (page 1. line 9), Ca. reads ऋषिश्चायस्माद्वेति परिभाषया । The writer seeing that he had left out ऋ between वे ति, made a mark at the top of वे, and wrote ऋ on the margin. The copyist of the first C. MS. mistook this mark for a vowel, and without looking to the margin wrote °ह्वेति. A. however has °ह्वेरिति. The same happened Rv. II. 6, 4, where Ca. had सूरिविद्वान्. This the original writer himself corrected into सूरिविद्वान्, only that the space did not allow him to do more than to make a mark at the top of वे, and to draw a slight line between र and व. The copyist of C. mistook this for सूरिविद्वान्, which henceforth became the reading of the C. MSS. Indeed it looks very much like सूरिविद्वान् in Ca. A. however reads सूरिविद्वान्. Rv. I. 181, 8. (p. 366. l. 24.) Ca. had originally जलय

प्रदानविशेषो वा. Accordingly all the C.'s read जलदः. A. however has जलदः, and from it the correction is made in Ca., where, subsequent to the taking of the first C. copy, the र was covered with yellow, and changed into द. जलदः is evidently an old mistake, because it occurs in B. also. Rv. III. 1, 8. (p. 626. l. 14.) the C. MSS. have-जनुषा जन्म मनुष्याणां, thus leaving out two lines. The omission was originally made by the writer of Ca., but afterwards supplied on the margin from A. That it was not supplied from B., but from A., can be proved by the words स्वत एव बंधुपति यावत्, which are not in B., but in A. only. At the beginning of the third Ashtaka (Rv. III. 7, 1.) the invocation in Ca. is simply श्रीगणेशाय नमः ॥ ओं वागीश etc. It is the same in the C.'s. A 2. has श्रीगणेशाय नमः ॥ श्रीसरस्वत्यै नमः ॥ श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ ॥ वागीश etc. The B.'s have श्रीगणेशाय नमः श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ वागीश; only B. (Taylor) has a slight correction श्रीगणेशाय etc. Coincidences of this kind though they may seem irrelevant are really the most convincing. Again, Rv. III. 7, 1. (p. 661. l. 7.) A 2. has त प्र य चारुः, while Ca. and the C.'s have the right reading तत् प्र य चारुः. In the same verse (p. 662. l. 3.) A 2. has श्रित्तिपृष्ठशब्दस्य; Ca. and the C.'s coincide in giving श्रित्तिपृष्ठस्य । पृष्ठशब्दस्य. Rv. III. 7, 2. (p. 663. l. 11.) Ca. has द्वितीयायां instead of the more primitive reading द्वितीयैकवचनांतस्य, which is in A 2. and B. The C.'s have again द्वितीयायां like Ca. As no case of this kind can be made out against A., it is necessary to regard the corrections in Ca. as collations from a MS. which was connected with the A. class. How A. and Ca. came originally to differ, is hard to say. But as it is impossible to account for the text of the one simply as a corruption of the other, A. and Ca. must be considered as two branches diverging from the original stock of Sáyana's work which is lost to us. A. and Ca. are coordinate, not subordinate, though A. stands higher than Ca. B. also stands independent from A. and Ca. The C. MSS. on the contrary are subordinate to Ca., or, as in later portions of the Commentary, to A., and must therefore be discarded where the evidence for a reading has to be weighed by the authority of MSS. Even in cases where the C. MSS., particularly C 2. and C 5., contain large portions of the Commentary which are taken from an A. MS., they are of very little use for restoring the original text of A., except occasionally in the second Ashtaka where A 2. is defective. Here C 5. (Wilson 74.) has sometimes supplied the deficiency, but the modern date and general incorrectness of this MS. hardly allow us even then to ascribe much weight to its readings.

If we compare the three MSS., A., Ca., and the C.'s at the beginning of the

second Ashtaka, it will be seen that they always confirm our view of their mutual relationship even in the most minute points. In कृतकृयाः (p. 1. 1. 2) Ca. had left out the Visarga, and it is wanting in the C.'s. It was afterwards added in Ca., above the line, कृतकृयाः, and it stands above the line in A. also. P. 1. 1. 6. Ca. had त्रेया instead of त्रेया. त्रेया became the reading of the C.'s, while in Ca. it was altered into त्रेया, which is the reading of A. P. 1. 1. 7. Ca. had शतनामाद्ये, which was corrected by the writer himself (not *secunda manu* or with yellow orpiment) into शतचिनामाद्ये. This correction was therefore adopted by the C.'s, and it is also the reading of A. P. 1. 1. 8. Ca. had अनुवाकै; one of the vowels was afterwards covered with yellow. The C. MSS. therefore read अनुवाकै; A. has अनुवाकै. P. 1. 1. 9. we read in Ca. पंचदशैर्चि. The C. MSS. adopt this as पंचदशैर्चि, while in Ca. it is corrected into पंचदशैर्चि as it stands in A. P. 1. 1. 10. देवा in Ca. was left out, and added on the margin. It is wanting in the C.'s. P. 1. 1. 11. Ca. had प्र वो ष्वैश्वदेवं. Here the copyist of the first C. MS. must have corrected the mistake, which was indeed very palpable, for the C.'s read वैश्वदेवं, which is also in Ca., but as a correction. P. 1. 1. 11. Ca. had अस्य विशेषो लिंगिकः. Thus the C.'s have अस्य विशेषो । लिंगिकः । Ca. was afterwards corrected into विशेषविनियोगो लिंगिकः, but in such a manner that none but a learned copyist could have made out the correction. A. however has the right reading. P. 1. 1. 17. Ca. had पातलशीलं, which became the reading of the C.'s. In Ca. it was altered into पालनशीलं, by putting १ over ल, and २ over त, and covering part of त with yellow. A. has distinctly पालनशीलं. Again (1. 18) after रुद्राय, रुत् is left out in Ca., and added from A. in the margin. It is wanting in the C.'s. Afterwards Ca. had originally तद्धेतुभूतं दुरितं द्रवयित्ते स्यंद्रावयित्ते । This was, not at all distinctly, corrected into दुरितं वा तस्य द्रावयित्ते, which is the reading of A. But the old mistake remained in the C.'s. After नामकाय (1. 19), देवाय is left out in Ca. and C.; it was added in Ca. from A. P. 2. 1. 1. इषुध्यान् शत्रू Ca. and C.; इषुध्या शत्रून् Ca. sec. man., and A. P. 2. 1. 3. सहि दिवो Ca. and C.; सह दिवो Ca. sec. man., and A. P. 2. 1. 5. द्यावापृथिव्योर्विधे Ca. The *i* in विधे is covered with yellow in Ca., so that one should expect विधे, in the C.'s, instead of which they have the correct reading विधे. On looking more closely, however, we find that the *i*, before it was covered with yellow, was already struck out with ink *prima manu*, which accounts for the adoption of the corrected reading in the C.'s. P. 2. 1. 5. अस्तौषि Ca. and C.; अस्तौषि Ca. sec. man. and A. P. 2. 1. 6. पतेः Ca. and C.; पतेः Ca. sec. man. and A. Ibidem, विवात उयादि रुः Ca.; विवात उयादि रुः C. The text of Ca. is corrected into विवातेवा औयादिको रुः, but in such a confused way, that the writer



of A. could hardly have got his correct text पिवतेऽसौ औणादिको रुः from Ca. P. 2. 1. 8. दिव ऊडिदं Ca. and C.; दिवः ऊडिदं Ca. sec. man. and A. P. 2. 1. 9. सौतिश्छांदसो Ca. and C.; सौतिश्छांदसो Ca. and A.; both sec. man. P. 2. 1. 10. दधातेः । किः Ca. C.; दधातेः किः । Ca. sec. man. and A. P. 2. 1. 10. कृत्स्नरेणां । तोदात्तः Ca. C.; कृत्स्नरेणांतोदात्तः Ca. sec. man. and A. P. 2. 1. 10. उदात्तत्वं Ca. C.; उदात्तत्वं Ca. sec. man. and A.

These are the various readings for one verse only. I have given them in full, partly to show that they confirm my view of the relation of the MSS. in the minutest detail, partly to convince those, who are so eager for a complete *varietas lectionis*, of the entire uselessness of such a compilation.

There is one more MSS. of Sáyana which has come to hand since the publication of the first volume, and which, though rarely quoted in the *varietas lectionis*, deserves to be mentioned here. It was sent to me as a present by Mr. T. Edward Hall of Benares, to whose zealous exertions Sanskrit literature is already greatly indebted. Unfortunately it is but a fragment, beginning with the twenty-seventh Varga of the third Adhyáya of the third Ashtaka, and ending at the end of the third Ashtaka. But it is of great importance in so far as it served to confirm those principles of diplomatic criticism on which all the other MSS. of Sáyana had been previously classified, and according to which their respective weight and authority had been determined. Its title is संवत् १६२४ वर्षे ॥ जामाढवदि ११ बुधे लिखितं ॥ श्रीरस्तु ॥ ॥ कल्याणमस्तु ॥ ॥ शिवमस्तु सर्वज्ञगत परहृतिनिरता भवन्ति । भूतगणा दोषा प्रयांतु नाशो स्तु सर्वत्र सुखी भवतु लोकाः ॥ ॥ कल्याणं भूयात् ॥ This shows that its age is exactly the same as that of Ca.; Samvat-1624, or A.D. 1681. Its readings would therefore have had considerable weight whether they coincided with any of the three classes or not. But on a close examination it was found that not a single reading, not even a mistake, occurred in this MS. which was not known already from the A. MSS. Nay, I feel almost convinced that Colebrooke's A. MS. was copied directly from the fragment which is now in my possession. Rv. IV. 2, 13. (vol. III. p. 18.) the whole explanation of the thirteenth verse had been left out in Aa., but was afterwards added so as to cover the whole margin, not without giving rise to many ambiguities by the indistinctness of the letters. All these ambiguous letters are reproduced with the greatest exactness in Colebrooke's MS., where the explanation stands no longer in the margin, but forms part of the Commentary. A still clearer case occurs Rv. IV. 4, 4. (vol. III. p. 35.) Here also the Commentary on verse 4. had been left out in Aa., and been supplied as far as the space allowed on the margin. We have first two long lines at the top of the page. After this the text is con-

tinued on the margin of the right side, then, on the margin of the left, and one line is placed under the last line of the text. I give as exact a copy of it as possible :

अथ चतुर्थी ॥ उदग्ने तिष्ठेति । तिग्महेते तिग्मास्तीक्ष्णा हेतयो ज्वाला यस्य स तथोक्तः तादृश हे अग्ने उन्निष्ठ रक्षोहननार्थं उद्यतो भवत् । शतून्प्रति आ तनुषु । ज्वालासंघं विस्तारय । तैस्त्रैजः संघैः अमितान् शतून् न्योषतात् नितरां दह हे समिधान स	
घातः अतसं	मिति ह्रीं
न । यथा शु	द्विं षमा
न्कमनार्द्रम	नाग्ने यः पुमान्
तंस काष्ठं द	न नो स्माक
हसि तद्वत्	मरातिं भा
वैषता त । उष	वप्रधानो नि
दाहे लोटि हे	ह्रेशः आरा
स्तुत्योरिति	तित्वं शाशनं
तातडादेशः ।	चक्रे कुरुते
धक्षि । दहे लो	अरातिम
टि बहुलं छंद	दानं वा कुरु
सीति शपो लु	ते तं पुमांसं
क् हो ढ इति ढ	नीवा न्यग्भू
त्वं भष्पभावः षढोः कः सीति कत्वं निघातः ॥	तं धक्षि द
	ह । तत्त ह

This is reproduced in Colebrooke's MS. (A 2.) in the following manner :

॥ चतुर्थी ॥ उदग्ने तिष्ठेति ॥ तिग्महेते तिग्मास्ती - हेतयो ज्वाला यस्य स तथोक्तः तादृश हे अग्ने उन्निष्ठ रक्षोहननार्थं उद्यतो भवत् । शतून्प्रति आ तनुषु ज्वालासंघं विस्तारय तैस्त्रैजः संघैः अमितान् शतून् न्योषतात् नितरां दह हे समिधान स"घातः अतसं न । यथा शुन्कमनार्द्रमतं स काष्ठं दहसि तद्वत् वैषताता उष दाहे लोटि हेस्तुत्योरिति तातडादेशः धक्षि । दहे लोटि बहुलं छंदसीति शपो लुक् हो ढ इति ढत्वं भष्पभावः षढोः कः सीति कत्वं निघातः ॥

"द्विमिति ह्रींष्यमानाग्ने यः पुमान् नो स्माकमरातिं भावप्रधाने निर्देशः अरातित्वं शाशनं चक्रे कुरुते तं पुमांसं नीवा न्यग्भूतं धक्षि दैहा तत्त ह"

If we compare the readings of the two MSS., and remember that both came from Benares, there can hardly be a doubt that the latter (A 2.) was copied directly from Aa. It is clear that the writer of Colebrooke's MS. was misled by the marginal notes of Aa., that he left out all that was written on the right margin, and went on from the end of the second line to the third line on the left margin. After having proceeded to the end of the verse he became aware of his mistake, and then added the whole omitted passage on the margin. This is nearly convincing. But there are other points to show that A 2. is a direct descendant of Aa. The ह्ण in तीक्ष्ण is very indistinct in Aa.; a blank is left in A 2. The च in ज्वालासंघं looks, according to Aa.'s style of writing, very much like च; A 1. has च. In

ईषतात् । the Virāma under ण is covered in Aa. by the ण of the next line; the writer of A 2. did not perceive this, and thus altered ण into णा. In Aa. the marked ण in the fourth line is meant as a correction of the marked ण in the third. The writer of A 2. began his marginal notes with the fourth line, mistook the third as an addition to come in after the marked ण, and thus wrote णमिति ही instead of निहिही. शत्रवं in Aa. would look exactly like शाशनं to one not familiar with the peculiar style of writing used in these marginal notes; in A 2. we find शाशनं. Other coincidences between Aa. and A 2. require no explanation. The only real difference between the two is निरंतरं in A 2. instead of नितरं in Aa.; a mistake evidently produced by the distraction of the writer, and the omission of the passage between कुरुते and कुरुते. This will be sufficient to show that Aa. is really the prototype of the A. MSS., and that therefore, if the whole of this MS. could have been recovered, it would have rendered to the A. class the same service which was rendered to the C. class by Ca.

## VARIETAS LECTIONIS.

### Maṇḍala I. Sūkta 122.

#### Ashṭaka II.

Page 2. l. 9. (I. 122, 1.) कर्मण्यधिकरणे च ॥ सप्तम्यधिकरणे च A. B. C. See Pāṇ. III. 3, 93, and II. 3, 36.

P. 4. l. 8. (122, 4.) प्रवर्षणध्वनियुक्तस्य A. Ca. प्रकर्षणध्वनियुक्तस्य C. प्रकर्षण ध्वनियुक्तस्य B.

P. 5. l. 25. (122, 7.) अवहन्धाना B. अवहन्धा A. C.

P. 8. l. 13. (122, 11.) Instead of लङ्, B. has लुङ्, A. and C. लङ्. If it were लङ्, the termination तः (i. e. त) would not be व्यत्ययेन; if it were लुङ्, the शपो लुक् could not be called छान्दसः ।

P. 9. l. 12. (122, 12.) येषु is omitted in A. B. C.

P. 9. l. 14. (122, 12.) Instead of लेटि, A. B. C. have लोटि.

P. 10. l. 1. (122, 13.) Instead of तत्रैतौणादिक उसिः, B. has औणादिको सुनु, A. and C. कोऽसुनु.

P. 10. l. 3. (122, 13.) किं प्रसाधयति A. C. प्रसादयति B.

P. 10. l. 4. (122, 13.) न प्रसाधयति ॥ संप्रसाधयति A. Ca. प्रसाधयति C. राजायति B.

P. 10. l. 6. (122, 13.) किं साधयति A. Ca. किं - धयति C. किं सादीयति B.

P. 10. l. 17. (122, 14.) °तस्मेव चाकंतु A. Ca. °तस्मेव वा चकंतु C. °तस्मेव वा चाकंतु B. l. 18. आचकन्ति A. आचाकन्ति Ca. प्रोवाचकं C. आसाचकं B.

P. 13. l. 17. (123, 4.) प्रतिहतमुद्योगं प्रकाशनरूपं ॥ प्रतिगृहमुद्योगं प्रकाशनरूपं A. Ca. प्रतिहतमुद्योगं प्रकाशनरूपं C. प्रतिहतमुद्योगप्रकाशनरूप B.

P. 15. l. 17. (123, 7.) परिष्कपयितोर्वै ॥ परिष्कपयितोर्वै B. परिष्कपयितोर्वै A. Ca. परिष्कितोर्वै C.

P. 16. l. 4. (123, 8.) न दृश्यते A. Ca. B. नश्यते C.

P. 16. l. 5. (123, 8.) All the MSS. read स चैकविंशतिघटिकाभिः षड्विंशतिपरभिश्च संमितः । except B., which has पराभि संमितः । There is no doubt a mistake in this part of the Commentary. A day consists of 60 Ghaṭikās, a Ghaṭikā of 60 Kalas, a Kala of 60 Nimeshas, a Nimesha of 30 Tatparas: cf. Bhāskara's Gunitādhyaṃya, I. 21, translated by Dr. Roer; Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, No. CXLV. p. 55. Now if, according to Sāyaṇa, the sun's daily course is 5059 Yojanas, which is the equatorial circumference of the earth, (cf. Bentley, Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy, p. 185,) the thirty Yojanas which are ascribed to the duration of twilight cannot correspond to 21 Ghaṭikās and 26 Paras, even if it were possible to take Para in the sense of Tatparas. The numbers 21, 26, however, are such that they seem to be based on calculation, though on a very inaccurate one. For

$$30 \text{ Yojanas} = \frac{30}{5059} \times 60 \times 60 \text{ Kalas}$$

$$= 21 + \frac{1761}{5059}$$

$$\text{And } \frac{1761}{5059} \text{ Kalas} = 60 \times \frac{1761}{5059} \text{ Nimeshas}$$

$$= 20 + \frac{4480}{5059}$$

$$\text{or } 30 \text{ Yojanas} = 21 \text{ Kalas} + 20\frac{4}{5}\frac{8}{9} \text{ Nimeshas.}$$

We get still nearer to Sāyaṇa's numbers if we put the approximate value  $\frac{1}{168}$  for the fraction  $\frac{3}{5059}$ . This gives 30 Yojanas = 21 Kalas + 25 $\frac{1}{2}$  Nimeshas.

P. 16. l. 10. (123, 8.) उदिता B. C. (?) उदितो A. Ca.

P. 16. l. 23. (123, 8.) यमकोट्यां ॥ यवकोट्यां A. Ca. B. ययवकोट्यां C. Cf. Reinaud, Mémoire sur l'Inde, p. 341; and Rāja Rādhakanta's Sabda-Kalpa-Druma s. v.

P. 17. l. 19. (123, 10.) जनांतिके विवसना A. Ca. B. वसना C.

P. 21. l. 18. (124, 3.) सम्यगानयित्वा (सम्यग्मानयित्वा is a misprint) सम्यगनयित्वा A. Ca. सम्यगमनयित्वा B. सम्यगनयित्वा C. If the causative of अण् could be formed with a short अ, the reading of A. would be correct.

P. 25. l. 2. (124, 7.) तां तु सभ्या विचार्य यदीयं रिक्तं लभते चेदक्षैः संताड्यु तदीयं धनं वितरन्ति A. Ca. There is evidently a mistake in the grammatical construction of this sentence. It lies either in चेद् or in संताड्यु. No help is to be derived from the various readings of the MSS. B. has चेदक्षैः; C 2. reads यदीयं रिक्तं लभते चेदक्षैः संतोड्यु 1; C 5. तां सभ्या विद्या विचार्य and संताड्यु. The Commentary on the Nirukta is of no use for the grammatical restitution of the text, but as it explains the custom alluded to by

Sāyana, I shall give here some extracts from it. गतैः सभास्याणुरिति । अक्षनिवपनपीठमित्यर्थः । गृणातिः स हि सत्यसंगरो भवति । संगीर्यते हि तत्र सत्यं । इदमत्र पतितमिदमत्र न पतितमित्येवं प्रायेण कितवास्तत्त्वानृतं ब्रुवते । तमेवंलक्षणं गतैमारोहति या स्त्री सा गतैरुगितुच्यते । तदेतन्नतैस्य सभास्याणोरारोहणं रिक्थलाभहेतुर्दाक्षिणात्येषुपुत्राया अपतिकायाः स्त्रियाः प्रसिद्धं । तथैव प्रसिद्धा निरुच्यते । देशसमाचारव्यवस्थयापि क्लृप्तिर्नत्वार्थो निर्वक्तव्य इत्येतदनेन प्रदर्शितं भवति । तं तत्र यापुत्रा यापतिका सारोहति । तं सभास्याणुं तत्र कितवमध्येऽवस्थितं यापुत्रा स्त्री यापतिका सारोहति तस्मिन्नुपविशतीत्यर्थः । ततः सा भर्तृबन्धुभ्यः सकाशाद्रिक्त्यं लभते । यस्तस्या भर्तृसक्तोऽंशस्तं । एवमसौ सनये लब्धये धनानां गतैमारोहति ।

P. 26. l. 4. (124, 8.) सम्यगननहेतव आपः समनाः । ता गच्छंतीति Ca. sec. manu. सम्यगागमनहेतवः B. सम्यगमन° A. C.

P. 27. l. 23. (124, 11.) दृष्टोदयो ॥ दृष्टोदयो B. दृष्टा जयो A. C.

P. 29. l. 19. (125, 1.) राजानुचरैः B. राजानुचरः A. C.

P. 29. l. 21. (125, 1.) स्वकीये चासन् उप° ॥ स्वकीयमांसनोप° C. Ca. pr. man. स्वकीयमनस्यमुप° B. स्वकीय चासने उप A. Ca. sec. man.

P. 29. l. 22. (125, 1.) किं नाम B. किं नाम A. C. Ibid. स च पृष्ठो मातरं पितरं च स्ववृत्तांतं चाचक्षे ॥ मातरं पितरं च स्ववृत्तांतं आचक्ष A. C. मातरपितरं च स्ववृत्तांतं आचक्ष B.

P. 30. l. 1. (125, 1.) राजन्त्यात् A. Ca. sec. man. C 5. राजत्वात् Ca. pr. man. C. B. Ibid. प्रतिग्रह इत्युक्तत्वात् B. प्रतिग्रहात् A. C.

P. 30. l. 4. (125, 1.) ऋषिरुग्निनामिकां ॥ ऋषिः उग्निनामिकां A. B. C. उग्निनामिकां would better be left out here or in the sixth line.

P. 32. l. 17. (125, 4.) इत्यध्वेवसितवंतमप्युप ॥ इत्यध्वेवसितवंतमप्युप B. इत्यवगतमिति उप A. इत्यवगतमपि उप Ca. C.

P32. l. 24. (125, 4.) प्राणिनः Ca. prima manu. C. B. प्राणिनं A. Ca. sec. man.

P. 37. l. 7. (126, 4.) यज्ञा घासाद्यन्नयंतः A. Ca. sec. man. — साधानयंतः C. and Ca. prima manu. ? चासाधनयंतः B.

P. 44. l. 7. (127, 5.) हविरन्नं ॥ हविरन्नं A. हविरन्नं Ca. prima manu. हविरन्नं C. हविरन्नं Ca. sec. man. हविरन्नतः B.

P. 45. l. 2. (127, 6.) अत एवानवग्रहः स एव शिष्यते ॥ एत एवानवग्रहः स एव शिष्यते B. एत एवानवाग्रः स एव शिष्यते A. Ca. अत एवानवाग्रः स एव शिष्यते C.

P. 47. l. 11. (127, 9.) उक्तगुणविशिष्टः C. गुणयुक्तविशिष्टः A. B. Ca.

P. 48. l. 10. (127, 10.) Instead of घृतादिहविर्वृक्ते read घृतादिप्रबुद्धहविर्वृक्ते A. B. Ca. °प्रयुङ्° C.

P. 49. l. 3. (127, 11.) युक्तेन त्वदायज्ञे मय्यनुग्रहयुक्तेनेत्यर्थः ॥ युक्तेन स्वकीयत्वेन मय्यनुग्रहयुक्तेनेत्यर्थः । A. Ca. sec. man. युक्तेन त्वदीयज्ञे मय्यनुग्रहयुक्तेनेत्यर्थः Ca. prima manu. C. युक्तेन स्वदायज्ञे मय्यनुग्रहयुक्तेनेत्यर्थः B.

P. 54. l. 17. (128, 6.) °रस्तु अपदेशमात्रेणेति भावः A. Ca. sec. man. °रस्तु विषदेशमात्रेति भावः Ca. pr. man. C. °रस्तूपदेशं B.

P. 59. l. 10. (129, 3.) रुद्रो वै क्रूरो यदग्निमग्निरिति । A. Ca. sec. man. रुद्रो वै क्रूरो यदग्निमग्निरिति C. pr. man. C. रुद्रो वा एष यदग्निमग्निरिति B.

P. 62. l. 5. (129, 6.) सुद्रमिव । श्रेष्ठं शक्यमुदकादिकमिव । उदकं यथा तिष्ठति स्रवन्नश्यति तथासावपीत्यर्थः । B. reads सुद्रमिवाश्रेष्ठं शक्यमुदकादिकमिव उदकं यथा तिष्ठति स्रवन्नश्यति तथासावपीत्यर्थः । A. has उदकं

यथा तिष्ठति सेवन्नश्यति, and C. तिष्ठति अवन्नश्यति । The mistake probably lies in तिष्ठति, instead of which a locative might be expected of a word meaning 'precipice,' or something similar, into which water falls and disappears. Two verbs like तिष्ठति and नश्यति put together without a copula is against the usual style of Sáyana. It would be irregular also to join सवन् or निसवन् to words like निष्ठ (loss, disappearance, end) or विष्ठ (faeces), reading निष्ठनिसवन् instead of तिष्ठति सवन्. Still less could तिष्ठति be taken for a locative, or in the sense of standing water (सरणि).

P. 65. l. 9. (129, 10.) All the MSS. read महते प्रीतये instead of महत्तै प्रीतये. It is possible that Sáyana himself wrote महते, intending to add, as he frequently does, अवसे or रक्षणाय. In this case he would have made the adjective agree, not with प्रीतये, but with रक्षणाय. As it is, the authority of the MSS. must give way before the claims of grammar.

P. 66. l. 12. (129, 11.) Instead of तमिंद्रं देवा न व्यसृज्यंतेत्यादि, B. reads तमिंद्रो देवता व सृज्यंतेत्यादि; C. and A. तमिंद्रो देवान् विसृज्यंतेत्यादि. We might read तमिंद्रं देवा व्यसृज्यंतेत्यादि, taking विसृज् in the sense of 'creating,' as it is frequently used in vaidik as well as epic works. This would correspond better with the text of the hymn, where it is said that Indra was created by his father to destroy the evil spirits. The words of the Commentator are probably a quotation from a Bráhmaṇa, and may thus still receive a safer correction.

P. 70. l. 6. (130, 4.) Instead of स्तोपयोगाय (A. C.), B. reads यागाय, which with reference to the Yúpa gives a good sense; but it is evidently a later correction of the transcribers. Ca. reads पयोगाय, and has स्तो in the margin.

P. 70. l. 27. (130, 5.) Instead of यस्यै कस्मैचित्समर्थाय तदर्थं, A. and Ca. sec. man. read यस्य कस्यचित्समर्थाय तदर्थं, C. यस्य कस्य न समर्थाय तदर्थं. In B. the whole sentence from यथा वा to यद्वा is left out. I have corrected it, because it seemed too ungrammatical for the time of Sáyana to have the pronoun in the genitive joined to a substantive in the dative. Similar barbarisms occur, however, in later works and less erudite authors.

P. 74. l. 14. (130, 9.) ततः करोति पूर्वं A. B. C.

P. 74. l. 24. (130, 9.) यथा त्वोतेन A. C. यथा चोणेनेन B. (चोरेण?).

P. 75. l. 10. (130, 10.) आष्टमिकमाद्युदात्तत्वं A. B. C. It refers therefore to Pán. VIII. 1, 19, and in particular to अपादादौ of VIII. 1, 18. The आद्युदात्तत्वं can be called आष्टमिकं only in a negative sense, or by way of प्रसुदाहरणं.

P. 78. l. 4. (131, 3.) यस्य गृहानित्यादिनैमित्तिकत्वा° ॥ यस्य गृहामित्यानै° A. यस्य गृहानित्यानै° C. Ca. यस्य गृहानित्यानैमित्तिककाम्यत्वा° B.

P. 78. l. 13. (131, 3.) किं हि वचनेन कुर्यान्नास्ति B. किं हि वचनं न कुर्या नास्ति C. किं हि वचनं न कुर्यानास्ति A. Ca.

P. 79. l. 16. (131, 4.) इमान्यप्कार्याणि ॥ इमानि अपकार्याणि A. Ca. इमानि अपकार्याणि C. इमानि अपः कार्याणि B.

P. 80. l. 6. (131, 5.) युद्धाय हि धीराः संभजंते । A. C. यद्वा ये धीराः संभजंते B.

P. 80. l. 7. (131, 5.) संग्रामवासिनस्त्वय्यन्यामन्यामन्यांश्चान्यांश्च ॥ °नः त्वय्यन्यामन्यः C. °नः त्वय्यन्यामन्यां A. Ca. °नः ॥ त्वयि अन्यामन्यां B.

P. 80. l. 11. (131, 5.) इत्यादेशे ॥ इत्यादेशे C. इत्यादेशे A. Ca. B.

P. 80. l. 24. (131, 6.) अपि नाम जानीहि B. अपि नाम तावकमसत् A. Ca. sec. m. नावकमसत् C. Ca. pr. m.

P. 81. l. 2. (131, 6.) गुणप्रतिषेधामः ॥ गुणाभावः A. B. C.

P. 82. l. 10. (132, 1.) Instead of हे मघवन् । मघः सौख्यं । तद्वचिन्द्र, which is the reading of A. and C., B. has the more usual explanation, हे मघवन् धनवचिन्द्र ।

P. 82. l. 11. (132, 1.) The Commentator explains इंद्रत्वोक्ताः as a compound without adverting at all to the irregularity of such a composition. The Pada-text does not separate इंद्र from त्वोक्ताः, and I have therefore left it as one word. If त्वोक्ताः is to be taken in the sense of 'protected by thee,' it must of course be separated from इंद्र, whilst if इंद्रत्वोक्ताः is one word, the first part is probably इंद्रत्व in the sense of 'the power of Indra,' and the whole means 'protected by the power of Indra.' The question is only how far we are allowed to alter the accent of the word. त्वाञ्जतः is a common expression; इंद्रत्वाञ्जतः occurs but once more in a hymn of Sobhari, VIII. 19, 16, where Sáyana explains it again by इंद्रेण ईश्वरेण त्वया जता रक्षिताः संतः ।

P. 82. l. 14. (132, 1.) The words पूर्व्ये धनेस्मिन्ने belong only to B., and may be a later addition. It often happens where Sáyana leaves words in the text without explanation, that the writers of B. supply them by conjecture.

P. 83. l. 11. (132, 2.) All the MSS. read करोतेः शतरि.

P. 84. l. 20. (132, 3.) प्रकाशं A. B. C. प्रकारं (?).

P. 85. l. 14. (132, 4.) तमेव यष्टारं B. The Commentator seems to distinguish कंचिद्व्रतं, which he explains by अयज्जानं, and दृष्टायंतं चिद्व्रतं, i. e. अस्मासु रोषं कुर्वंतमेव यष्टारं. A. and C. however read कुर्वंतं तमेवायष्टारं ।

P. 87. l. 19. (132, 6.) This quotation from Śaunaka refers to his Rig-vidhāna, of which two MSS. exist in the E. I. H. Collection, No. 1732. Both leave out the second verse from ता जपन् तु समश्नुते । which is found, however, in all the MSS. of Sáyana. In the first verse A. Ca. read उभे पुनामीति सूक्ते समर्चस्तु प्रकीर्तिताः । C. समर्चैः सुप्रकीर्तिताः । I have adopted the text of B. उभे पुनामीति पुरा रिपुष्यस्तु प्रकीर्तिताः । as it coincides with both the MSS. of the Rig-vidhāna, only that 1732 a. reads परा instead of पुरा. For the same reason I have adopted नियञ्जति at the end of the third verse; it rests on the authority not only of B., but also of the Rig-vidhāna MSS. 1732 a. and b. A. and C. read निकृति instead.

P. 88. l. 2. (133, 1.) I am not quite certain whether महीः is explained by उर्वीः । The passage is wanting in B.; A. Ca. sec. m. read महीः तुर्वीः, Ca. pr. m. and C. महीः सवीः ।

P. 90. l. 19. (133, 6.) द्युलोक आश्रयभूतः ॥ द्युलोकः आश्रयभूतः B. द्युलोको नामाश्रयभूतः A. द्युलोक-  
नामाश्रयभूतः Ca. sec. m. द्युलोकानाश्रयभूतः C. Ca. pr. m. (द्युलोको देवानामाश्रयभूतः?).

P. 91. l. 1. (133, 6.) विचिंत्वाग्निं A. Ca. विविचिंत्वाग्निं C. इत्यग्निं B.

P. 91. l. 11. (133, 6.) तिस्रैः सत्वभिस्त्रिभिः सप्तभिर्वा सत्वभिरनु° A. Ca. तिस्रैः त्रिभिः सप्तभिर्वा° C.  
तिस्रैः सत्वभिः सत्वभिर्वा सत्वभिरनु° B.

P. 93. l. 2. (134, 1.) छांदस उपधालोपः A. C. छांदस तुलोपः B.

P. 93. l. 13. (134, 2.) अभिषवदशा° B. C. अभिषवः दशा° A. Ca. pr. m.

P. 94. l. 17. (134, 3.) ससतीमुपपत्ता A. C. ससती पत्ता° B.

P. 94. l. 19. (134, 3.) कर्मव्यग्रेष्वेषत्सपंतं A. C. omitted in B. व्यग्रेष्व = व्यग्रतया or वैयग्रेष्व.

P. 97. l. 27. (135, 1.) After नियुता, B. adds नियुत्त्रिरागच्छेति शेषः । यद्वा.

P. 98. l. 25. (135, 2.) यद्व्येन A. B. C., not यद्व्यत्वेन.

P. 101. l. 26. (135, 6.) अभिलक्ष्यासृज्यंत ॥ अभिसृज्यालक्ष्यंत A. Ca. B. अभिलक्ष्यासृज्यंत C.

P. 102. l. 16. (135, 7.) प्रियतय्यात्मिका A. B. C. instead of the more usual प्रियसत्यात्मिका.

P. 106. l. 11. (136, 2.) संगतमभूत् । A. and C. read संगतोऽभूत्, while B. leaves it out altogether. Perhaps it is a repetition from the preceding line; but if it is at all to be repeated here, it must be संगतं instead of संगतो. The same fault occurs again in all the MSS., line 14, संगतोऽभूत् instead of संगतमभूत्.

P. 106. l. 16. (136, 2.) All the MSS. have यद्वपि, and again तथा यद्वपि. The sense, however, would become much clearer if the first यद्वपि was omitted.

P. 106. l. 20. (136, 2.) दधाते । धारयतः । दधाये । A. Ca. दधाये धारययः । C. दधाये । धारययः B. And again line 22, दधाये A. C., दधाये B. P. 107. l. 8. also, all the MSS. have सचेचे instead of सचेते, but explain it by भवतः ।

P. 107. l. 6. (163, 3.) Here again Sáyana's Commentary follows a different text from that which we find in the MSS. of the Rig-veda. All the MSS. read धारयत्क्षितिं as one word, while Sáyana explains it as two, धारयत् क्षितिं, which is evidently wrong.

P. 108. l. 25. (136, 5.) Here also instead of पातः । परितो रक्षतं ॥ A. C. have पायः । परितो रक्षतं । B. पातः । परितो रक्षतं । Cf. p. 106. l. 20.

P. 112. l. 9. (137, 2.) सोमासः सोमा—तमिति शेषः । A. Ca., except that they read दध्याश्रयण° and यावभिर°. C. leaves out the whole from दध्याशिरो to दध्याशिरा, and has also यावभिर°. B. has सोमासः सोमाः ग्रावभिः इभिषुताः संपन्नाः अत अयातमिति शेषः । दध्याशिरः ॥ दध्याश्रयणवतः इमे—तमिति शेषः । only leaving out सोमाः before सुतासो मंत्रेण.

P. 113. l. 7. (137, 4.) केवल सौणादिकोऽरप्रत्ययः ॥ केवल सौणादिको अरिप्रत्ययः । A. Ca. B. केवल सौणादिको अरिप्रत्ययः । C. See, however, Unādi-Sūtra III. 131.

P. 114. l. 7. (138, 1.) इति शेषः । A. B. C.

P. 115. l. 4. (138, 2.) अवं कृधि कुर्वितर्यैः ॥ अवं अधि कुर्वितर्यैः A. Ca. अवं अ । धि कुर्वितर्यैः । C. अवं कृधि कुर्वितर्यैः । B.

P. 116. l. 8. (138, 4.) पादपूरणः । All the MSS. read here पदपूरणः, and throughout they vary between पद° and पाद°. I have always adopted पादपूरण in the text: cf.



Pāṇ. VI. 1, 134. सोऽच लोये चेत्पादपूरणं ; VI. 1, 57. गोःपादन्ति ; and VIII. 1, 18. अनुदात्तं सर्वमपादादौ । In the Nirukta I. 9., however, we read अत्र ये प्रवृत्तेऽर्थेऽमिताक्षरेषु ग्रंथेषु वाक्यपूरणा आगच्छन्ति पदपूरणास्ते मितक्षरेषु, and I find no various reading in the MSS. of the Nirukta or of its Commentary. In the Prātiśākhya again we have पादपूरण, as Pr. A. XII. 103. क्रियावाचकमाख्यातमुपसर्गो विशेषकृत् । सत्वाभिधायकं नाम निपातः पादपूरणः ॥

P. 116. l. 9. (138, 4.) पूषनामेदं । A. Ca. पूषणामेदं C. पूषणमिदं B.

P. 116. l. 10. (138, 4.) ओ इति ॥ अजाः ओ इति । A. Ca. B. अजाः ऊं इति । C. These readings have probably arisen from the word अजाः, which had occurred several times before, and was still in the mind of the transcribers. It is evidently an old mistake. Either it owes its origin to a mere *lusus memoriae*, or, what is more likely, it is a corruption of आइ उ instead of ओ.

P. 116. l. 14. (138, 4.) यद्वा अघृणे ॥ यद्वा आहृणे A. यद्वा आहूयमान B.

P. 118. l. 9. (139, 2.) त्वदुद्देश्यैः and त्वदासक्तेन A. B. C. instead of युष्मद् or तद् ।

P. 118. l. 10. (139, 2.) आत्मीयैरनन्यैश्चक्षुरादीन्द्रियैः ॥ आत्मीयैरन्यैश्चक्षुरा A. C. आत्मीयैरिन्द्रियैः B. But line 11, B. reads अस्मदीयैश्चक्षुरादीन्द्रियैर्नासाद्यं, while A. has अस्मदीयैरिन्द्रियैः मनासाद्यं, C. अस्मदीयैरिन्द्रियैः स नसाद्यं.

P. 119. l. 23. (139, 4.) वां युवयोर्वंधुरे C. वां युवयोर्वंधुरत्तय B. युवां युवयोर्वंधुरे A. Ca. The reading may have been वां युवां युवयोः; but it is not unlikely that Śāyana himself wrote वां युवयोः, though युवां would have made the sentence much clearer. That Śāyana himself had not written युवां, I conclude from this, that वंधुरे, which is here left out in B., is some lines further down wrongly inserted after another वां युवयोः. It is curious, however, that वंधुरे should occur after this second वां युवयोः, not only in B., but in A. also, though in A. it had been inserted in its right place. वां युवां युवयोः would be the best reading, and might be defended by A. and Ca.

P. 119. l. 25. (139, 4.) स्थाम । अस्थापयाम ॥ स्थाम स्थापयाम । B. स्थाम तस्थापयामास । C. Ca. pr. m. स्थाम स्थापयामास । A. Ca. sec. m.

P. 121. l. 25. (139, 7.) आवाहनं । A. B. C.

P. 122. l. 12. (139, 7.) लब्ध्वेव वा लोपस्त इति तलोपः ॥ लब्ध्वेव Ca. A. (but Ca<sup>a</sup> 5. has ल - व वा.) लब्ध्वेव वा लोपस्त इति लोपः । C. लोपस्त इति तलोपः । B.

P. 124. l. 5. (139, 9.) The last lines of the Commentary contain several difficult passages, probably owing to defects in the original MS. C. leaves out the words from अस्माकं to जन्मा, and instead of संबद्धा यागा वा, A. Ca. read संबद्धा या गावाः, B. संबद्धा यागा वा. The most difficult sentence, however, is the following: असौ विशिष्टजन्मा वो यदा योग्ये इति तैर्वैकृत्यत्वेन तदधीनत्वं । A. Ca. C. leaves out the first words and begins अथो यदा योग्ये इति निर्वैकृत्यत्वेन तदधीनत्वं. B. again has असौ विशिष्टा जन्मा चो यदा योग्ये इति ॥ तैर्वैकृत्यत्वेन तदधीनत्वं. None of these readings can be the right one, and I was obliged to write by conjecture असौ विशिष्टजन्मा चो यद्ययोग्य इति तैर्वैकृत्यत्वेन तदधीनत्वं. दा or द्वा is a common mistake for इ in Sanskrit MSS. The sense would be, 'These old sages know my noble descent, and as they live amongst the great Rishis they can tell them

that this man (I myself, Parucchepa,) is of noble origin, and therefore fit to offer sacrifices. In this way our sacrifices may be said to be dependent on them.' Afterwards B. leaves out the words from वाचा वाचा, while both the other MSS. insert सर्वो जनः before किंच, but without a verb corresponding to it. In B. we have afterwards, after नमामि चेत्यर्थः, the words तथा इंद्राग्निं गिरा आनमे । ह पूरुषः । which occur neither in A. nor C. ह पूरुषः refers to the ह in the first Páda; the other words serve as a commentary to that portion of the text of which Sáyana's explanation had been lost in B.

P. 124. l. 26. (139, 10.) वृष्टुत्पन्नैः B. C. वृष्टुत्पन्नैः A. Ca. वृष्टुत्पादनैः or वृष्टुदकैः ? ॥

P. 127. l. 2. (140, 1.) ज्ञानविचारकत्वादिति भावः A. C. ज्ञानाति ॥ रेकत्वादिति भावः B.

P. 127. l. 4. (140, 1.) हृद्येन ॥ हृद्येन A. Ca. दूद्येन C. वृद्येन B.

P. 131. l. 8. (140, 8.) इवाकुटिलाः A. B. C.

P. 131. l. 20. (140, 8.) प्राणयन् रक्षति A. C. प्राणान् रक्षति B.

P. 132. l. 6. (140, 9.) विवने A. Ca. sec. m. विचरे C. विवारे B.

P. 133. l. 22. (140, 12.) After दुःखात्मकस्य a word like संसारस्य is required, but is omitted in all the MSS.

P. 140. l. 12. (141, 9.) विश्वया विश्व इव विश्वात्मक इव विभुर्मित्वायैमात्मना सर्वव्यापी परिभूः स्वतेजसा सर्वतः परिभविता सन् A. C. विश्वया सर्वथा विभुः प्रभुः परिभूः परिभविता सन् B. सर्वथा omitted in B 3.

P. 141. l. 25. (141, 12.) उतशब्दोऽप्यर्थः । स च संभावनायां B. उतशब्दो स च संभावनायां C. उत-शब्दोऽत्र संभावनायां A. Ca. sec. m.

P. 142. l. 3. (141, 12.) चंद्ररथः सुवर्णमयरोपेतः A. Ca. sec. m. चंद्ररथः आह्लादरथः B. चंद्ररथः C. Ca. pr. m.

P. 142. l. 18. (141, 13.) शब्दयंतु । निष्पूर्वः स्तनतिः शब्दकर्मो ॥ शब्दयंतु । निष्पूर्वः स्तनोति शब्दकर्मो B. शब्दयंतुः पूर्वः । स्तनोति शब्दकर्मो C. शब्दयंतीत्यर्थः । तनोति शब्दकर्मो A. Ca. sec. m.

P. 142. l. 21. (141, 13.) अभिनिसः स्तनः शब्दसंज्ञायां ॥ अभिनिसस्तनः शब्दसंज्ञायां B. अतिनिः श्रसं नश्यतु संतु संज्ञायां A. Ca. (नस्यंत C<sup>a</sup> 5.) अति निः असां नश्यतु संज्ञायां C.

P. 144. l. 16. (142, 3.) अद्य क्षणे B. C. आद्युपेक्षणे A. Ca.

P. 149. l. 3. (142, 13.) यक्षमाणादेवतानां ताः B. यक्षमाणादेवतानां ताः A. Ca. देवतानां नाः C.

P. 152. l. 10. (143, 5.) वरुणाय ॥ वरुणाय A. Ca. B. रणाय C.

P. 153. l. 13. (143, 7.) यद्वा प्रतीकमंगं । दीप्तज्वालाभित्यर्थः B. यद्वा प्रदीप्तमंगं दीप्तज्वालाभित्यर्थः A. Ca. deest in C. (लभित्यर्थः C<sup>a</sup> 5.)

P. 153. l. 17. (143, 7.) अनुक्रांतो वा A. B. C. अनाक्रांतो वा ?

P. 154. l. 22. (144, 1.) आ चतुर्थ्यात्मकेशोऽभिसमीक्ष्येतेदं करिष्यतीत्युक्तत्वात् ॥ आ चतुर्थ्यात्मकेशोऽभिसमीक्ष्येतेदं करिष्यतीत्युक्तत्वात् A. Ca. आ चतुर्थ्यात्मकेशो भिसमीक्ष्येतेदं करिष्येति तुक्तत्वात् C. आ चतुर्थ्यात्मकेशो भिसमीक्ष्येतेदं करिष्यतीत्युक्तत्वात् B. (आ चतुर्थ्यात् कर्मेशो तिसमीक्ष्येतेदं करिष्यतीत्युक्तत्वात् C<sup>a</sup> 5.)

P. 157. l. 7. (144, 5.) त्रिशो विशः A. Ca. त्रिशो विशः B. संगुलयः विषाः परस्परं C. In Rájajvan's Commentary on the Nighantū त्रिशः is derived from विशः प्रवेशने । किंपि रेण उपजनः । He also quotes this passage from the Rig-veda, with the Commentary of Mádhava, which differs, however, from our text: कर्मसु धीयमाना दशांगुलय इति माधवभाष्यं ॥

P. 157. l. 13. (144, 5.) अधिशब्दोऽनर्थको शत्वर्थमात्रानुवादी ॥ अधिशब्दानर्थके शत्वर्थमात्रानुवादी A. Ca. (त्वत् C<sup>a</sup> 5.) अधिशब्दो र्थको शत्वर्थमात्रानुवादी C. अधिशब्दो नर्थकत्वान्वदर्थमात्रानुवादी B.

P. 158. l. 25. (145, 1.) From the sixth to the thirteenth Sūkta of the twenty-first Anuvāka there is a mistake in the Commentary as to the number of each hymn.

P. 159. l. 8. (145, 1.) यत्सर्गादिविषयं प्रष्टव्यमस्ति तत्तस्यैव प्रष्टव्यमस्ति । तस्यैव प्रष्टव्यत्वे ॥ स्वर्गादिविषयं प्रष्टव्यमस्ति तत्तस्यैव प्रष्टव्यत्वे A. B. Ca. यत्सर्गादिविषयं प्रष्टव्यमस्ति तत्तस्यैव प्रष्टव्यमस्ति । तत्तस्यैव प्रष्टव्यमस्ति । तत्तस्यैव प्रष्टव्यत्वे C.

P. 159. l. 15. (145, 1.) असाध्यं नियम्यापि साधयितुं शक्नोति इत्यर्थः A. C. °म्यानापि B. (°म्य नापि साधयितुं शक्नोति ?.)

P. 160. l. 17. (145, 3.) मंचाः क्रोशंतीतिवत् A. Ca. मंचाः क्रोशंतीतिवत् C. मंचाः ॥ क्रोशंतीतिवत् B.

P. 160. l. 22. (145, 3.) तथात्रैव परस्तादाश्वासते ॥ पुरस्ताद् A. B. C. See, however, I. 161, 6.

P. 168. l. 6. (147, 4.) अन्यान्वाप्यस् A. B. C. अन्यान्वापि यान्यस् ?.

P. 168. l. 14. (147, 5.) कर्ता A. B. C. कर्तारं ?.

P. 169. l. 11. (148, 1.) सृष्टा मनोरपत्वं A. C. सृष्टा मनस्यतिः पुनर्मनस्वीभावे मनोरपत्वं B. and Nirukta.

P. 169. l. 16. (148, 1.) स्मृतो भासं ज्योतिषां स्मृतो भासेति वेति A. Ca. sec. man. स्मृतौ ना सं ज्योतिषां सजो भासं ज्योतिषां स्मृतो भासेति वेति C. स्मृतो रसान्स्मृतो भासं ज्योतिषां स्मृतो भासेति वा B. and Nirukta.

P. 171. l. 21. (148, 5.) ईहयूपा भयेऽपि A. B. C. ईहयूपोभयेऽपि ? . ईहयूपा गर्भेऽपि ?.

P. 172. l. 27. (149, 2.) उत्पादक इत्यर्थः । एवं सर्वोत्पादकः अत्रोभिः ॥ उत्पादक इत्यर्थः । एवं सर्वोत्पादक इत्यर्थः । एवं सर्वोत्पादकः अत्रोभिः A. Ca. sec. m. उत्पादक इत्यर्थः । एवं सर्वोत्पादकः अत्रोभिः B. उत्पादक इत्यर्थः । एवं सर्वोत्पादक इत्यर्थः एवं सर्वोत्पादक इत्यर्थः एवं सर्वोत्पादक इत्यर्थः एवं सर्वोत्पादकः अत्रोभिः C. उत्पादक इत्यर्थः । एवं सर्वोत्पादक इत्यर्थः । एवं सर्वोत्पादक इत्यर्थः । एवं सर्वोत्पादकः अत्रोभिः Ca. pr. m. C<sup>a</sup> 5.

P. 173. l. 5. (149, 2.) Instead of प्रापयति, Prof. Wilson proposes प्राणयति, which would certainly be more appropriate; but all the MSS. have प्रापयति.

P. 173. l. 7. (149, 2.) यद्यग्निर्न पचेत् पूरयेदेव नोत्पद्यते A. Ca. B. यद्यग्निर्न पचेत् ॥ पूरयेद् C. C<sup>a</sup> 5. (पूरयेदेव B 3.) I conjecture यद्यग्निर्न पचेत् पूरयेद्देहो नोत्पद्यते. Prof. Wilson, whom I consulted on this passage, gives the following explanation: "I do not think any conjecture is necessary, but that उत्पद्यते may be used impersonally, or with *id* or तद् for its nominative. 'When Agni does not mature or verily fill (or satisfy), *it* is not produced; that is, nothing is produced, production does not take place.' The construction is elliptical, but not unintelligible. With reference, however, to the phrase पश्चादिदेहाकारेण, देहो might be inserted, but it is not indispensable."

P. 176. l. 24. (150, 3.) In the Chândogya-upanishad (VII. 10), from which these words are taken, the text is मासेभ्यः पितृलोकं पितृलोकादाकाशमाकाशाच्चंद्रमसमेव सोमो राजा.

P. 177. l. 16. (151, 1.) तच्चैकया द्वित्वादपि स्यात् A. तच्चैकया द्वित्वादपि स्यात् Ca. C. तच्चैकया द्वित्वादपि स्यात् B. The sense is that गन्धर्वः expresses merely the possession of cows, even where a man possesses (or wishes to possess) only a few of them; गोषु, the

plural, is therefore added to show that many cows are intended. One expects something like तच्चैकगोस्वामित्वादपि स्यात्, or तच्चैकद्वितित्वादपि स्यात्, but neither is quite satisfactory. Prof. Wilson proposes तच्चैकया द्वित्वादपि or एकया द्वित्वादपि स्यात्, explaining it by "in this place by one (or the singular), two, three, or more may be;" that is, he who wishes for a cow, means he who wishes for many cows; as Gopati, 'lord of a cow,' means 'lord of many cows,' etc.

P. 180. l. 16. (151, 5.) मेघाच्छत्रे सति ॥ मघच्छत्र सति B. घच्छत्र संति C. घच्छत्रति संति A. Ca.

P. 182. l. 15. (151, 8.) ददाये इत्यर्थः ॥ ददात इत्यर्थः A. Ca. sec. m. ददत इत्यर्थः Ca. pr. m. C. Ca 5. B.

P. 183. l. 4. (151, 9.) न तरत इत्यर्थः ॥ न नरतत इत्यर्थः A. C. न नरत इत्यर्थः B. न रतत इत्यर्थः Ca 5.

P. 183. l. 19. (152, 1.) चीनौ A. Ca. sec. m. B. चीनौ Ca. pr. m. C. Ca 5.

P. 184. l. 15. (152, 2.) संतोऽपि ॥ संत्यपि A. Ca. B. सत्यपि C. Ca 5.

P. 186. l. 21. (152, 6.) यथा शिष्टं भिक्षेत यथा च कर्म समापनेन रक्षेत ॥ यथाशिष्टं भिक्षेत यथा स कर्मसमापनेन रक्षेत A. C. यथाशिष्टं भिक्षित यथा स कर्मसमापने वक्षेत B.

P. 187. l. 23. (153, 1.) धीतिभिः स्वकीयैः कर्मभिर्भरन्ति ॥ धीतिभिः स्वकीयैर्भरन्ति A. B. C.

P. 192. l. 22. (154, 4.) The quotation from the Chandogyaśanyaka is evidently made from memory, and therefore not very accurate. As it is difficult to correct Śāyana's text, I add the passage from the original (VIII. 2 and 3): स त्वेव सोम्येदमय आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयं तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति । "तत्तेजोऽमृजत" । तत्तेज ऐक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति तदपोऽमृजत । ता आप ऐक्षत बह्व्यः स्याम प्रजायेमहीति ता अन्नममृजत ॥ ॥ सेयं देवतैक्षत हंताहमिमास्त्रिसो देवता अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणीति तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकां करवाणीति ॥ Instead of हंताहमिं, A. and C. read हतमिं, B. हंतेमं.

P. 193. l. 6. (154, 5.) B 1. contains sundry marginal notes to this hymn, which, being addressed to Vishnu, was probably of greater interest to the Brāhmanas than hymns to Agni, Vāyu, etc. These notes are generally of little value. One of them has already been received into the text by B 2. and B 3. Both of them add नाथावीजादितिरभिगदिते सत्यपि after परमेश्वरस्य. B 1. has as a marginal note to मध्व उत्सः, समृतस्योत्पत्तिः वतैते; and it gives सुकर्मणां in addition to सुकृतिनां. But these notes have not found their way into B 3.

P. 193. l. 26. (154, 6.) B 1. has अनायासेन गंतारः as a marginal note to अयासः ॥

P. 194. l. 24. (155, 1.) सर्वलोक A. B. C. स्वर्लोक? cf. 155, 5.

P. 196. l. 3. (155, 3.) छावापृथिव्योः स्थापितं सामर्थ्यं A. C. छावापृथिव्योः (संबन्धि in marg.) स्थापितं लिङ्गं सामर्थ्यं B.

P. 197. l. 22. (155, 6.) विविधानेव स्वभावान् A. Ca. sec. m. विविधानेन स्व° Ca. pr. m. C. विविधानैनेकस्व° B.

P. 200. l. 12. (156, 3.) यद्वा नाम यज्ञनामनमनं विष्णुरेव ॥ यद्वा नाम यज्ञनामनमनं विष्णुरेव A. Ca. sec. m. यद्वा नाम यज्ञनामनमनं विष्णुरेव C. एक नाम यज्ञनामनामनं विष्णुरेव B.

P. 202. l. 10. (157, 1.) अयुक्षातां. The Commentator seems to have read अयु-क्षातां; this in the Sandhi-text gives आयुक्षातां, which is the reading of the MSS.

P. 204. l. 22. (157, 6.) Instead of रथ्येभिः, S 3. has रथ्येभिः ।

P. 205. l. 3. (157, 6.) Before आ वां, A. has the words सर्वत्र रथा युवां, C. सर्वत्र रथयो वां or सर्वत्र रथयो वां. They are wanting in B., and refer to another hymn addressed to the Ásvins.

From the beginning of the third Adhyāya to the end of Varga 13. I possess fragments of a MS. which was procured for me at Calcutta. It is a modern copy, but it contains very useful readings, and the original from which it was copied seems to have been an excellent MS. I ascertained, however, that the Pandit who copied it for me had occasionally inserted corrections of his own. On this account the readings of this MS. ought to be tested by their own intrinsic value only; and in the few cases where the MS. had to be quoted I have called it D., because it cannot claim a place in any one of the three historical families of Sáyana's manuscripts.

P. 208. l. 11. (158, 4.) रथमवधं तं त्वैनो A. C. रथमवधं तं त्वितनो B.

P. 208. l. 18. (158, 4.) दशतयो दशवारः ॥ दशतारः A. B. C. दशतयोऽपरिमितावयवः (cf. Pán. V. 2, 42) दशतारः D.

P. 209. l. 24. (158, 6.) वलीपलितगात्रो. All the MSS. read वलीपलितगात्रो, where पलित is too unusual an expression to be retained. However, वलीपलितगात्रो also is not satisfactory, and the reading of D., बलिवलितगात्रो, offers at least a probable conjecture.

P. 212. l. 4. (159, 3.) जहुः । ज्ञातवन्तः A. C. sec. m. ज्ञातवन्तः B. Ca. pr. m. C.

P. 213. l. 1. (159, 5.) From here to 161, 3. A 1. is wanting (p. 213—218).

P. 214. l. 12. (160, 1.) उदकोत्पादनायाप्रयत्नवयावित्यर्थः ॥ °नमयतीत्यर्थः B. °नमयती इत्यर्थः C. °नमयतीत्यर्थः D. D. explains कवि by शब्दमुदकं, while B. and C. leave it unexplained. शब्दमुदकं would be better.

P. 214. l. 13. (160, 1.) वृक्षदकधारयत्स्योपिने ॥ धारीवित् B. धारवित् C. धारिवित् C. धारित्वत् D.

P. 215. l. 19. (160, 3.) विश्वाहा is not explained in B. and C. D. supplies it as usual.

P. 216. l. 11. (160, 4.) लिटि रेफसामान्यात् Ca. sec. m. रेसामान्यात् B. Ca. pr. m. C. This refers to Pán. VII. 4, 71: कृकौरैकदेशस्य रेफस्य हलत्वे न ग्रहणादिहापि नृद्. D. has रश्चुतिसामान्यात्.

P. 219. l. 19. (161, 4.) D. adds अचेरिदं वाक्यं at the beginning of the fourth verse. None of the other MSS. have it.

P. 220. l. 12. (161, 5.) उपह्वकाले B. उपह्व C. A. or उपह्व.

P. 220. l. 26. (161, 6.) परस्ताच्च ॥ पुस्ताच्च A. B. C.

P. 221. l. 1. (161, 6.) विश्वरूपामित्यस्याश्च पंक्तिरिति B. D. विश्वरूपाविति च तस्याश्चपंक्तिमिति केचन A. विश्वरूपामिति च तस्याश्च पंक्तिरिति C.

P. 221. l. 5. (161, 6.) इत्येवमृषिराह ॥ °विमाह A. B. C.

P. 222. l. 8. (161, 8.) अथवा अमुन्यति तस्यैवेदं वाक्यं A. B. C. D. writes मन्त्रस्यैव° by conjecture. तस्य however refers to अचेः.

P. 223. l. 23. (161, 10.) पिंशति । अपर ॥ पिंशति पित्तोः अपरः A. B. C. D. has पिंशति पित्तोः अपरः. Perhaps पित्तोः belongs to तयोर्न किंचिद्, and may have been an old marginal gloss.

P. 226. l. 14. (161, 14.) चंतरिक्षात् after द्युलोकात् would better be omitted; but it stands in A. B. C. D.

P. 226. l. 24. (162, 1.) The words from षड्विंशति to शिष्टा are wanting in A. and C. B. has अधिवचेत् instead of आवचेत्. D. adds अस्मात्पुरस्तात् after the first शिष्टा, with reference to the following इयस्मात्पुरस्ताद्.

P. 228. l. 2. (162, 2.) After शतृ D. adds यद्वा छांदसः शपः द्युः । एरनेकाच इति यत् ॥

P. 228. l. 17. (162, 3.) I have added the words अहोरात्रे—उक्तत्वात् from D., as the meaning of Sáyana would scarcely be intelligible without them.

P. 229. l. 11. (162, 8.) All the MSS. have अवाप्नोतिस्त्रोपः (त्रलोपः B.), though in A. and C. it looks more like अवाप्नोः. I cannot find the passage in Pāṇini to which this quotation refers. The rules for the nominative singular of the word in question are Pāṇ. III. 2, 71, 1 and 2. श्वेतवहादीनां इस्. D. therefore adds after अत्रोपः the words अवयाः श्वेतवाः पुरोडाशेति निपातितः. Cf. Pāṇ. III. 2, 71, 3, and VIII. 2, 67.

P. 229. l. 13. (162, 5.) प्रशास्ता A. B. C. प्रशस्ता D.

P. 230. l. 1. (162, 6.) D. reads उत अपि च ये यूपाईस्य द्वित्रस्य काष्ठस्य वाढारः ॥

P. 230. l. 7. (162, 6.) बलेन A. B. C. फलेन D.

P. 230. l. 16. (162, 7.) प्रात्रपाश्वैर्भागः B. प्रात्रपाश्वैर्भाग A. Ca. प्रात्रात्पाश्वैर्भाग C. D. has पश्चाद्भागः, which would correspond better with पृष्ठः.

P. 233. l. 1. (162, 12.) यथास्माभिरश्च उपालम्ब्य एवं स्पृहयंति ॥ यथास्माभिरश्च उपालम्ब्य एवं स्पृहयंति B. यथास्माभिरश्च उपालम्ब्य एवं स्पृहयंति A. Ca. यथास्माभि अश्च उपालम्ब्य एवं स्पृहयंति C. यथास्माभिरश्च उपालम्ब्य एवं स्पृहयंति D. यथास्मभ्यमश्चे? or अस्माभिरुपलम्ब्यमश्चे?.

P. 233. l. 7. (162, 13.) मांस्पचन्याः, S. I. 2, 3. P. I. 2. See, however, Prātisākhya I. 4, 101.

P. 234. l. 1. (162, 14.) यद्वा बंधनं वट् तद्धतं प्रदेशं A. C. B. has पट्. Some words are wanting to complete this sentence. तद्धान्प्रदेशः, however, is not likely to have been the original reading.

P. 234. l. 20. (162, 15.) यद्वा इष्टं प्रयाजैरप्रीतं वीतं पयैर्गिनकृतं A. B. C. यद्वा इष्टं प्रयाजे वीतं प्रीतिरपयैर्गिनकृतं D. It would be better to read यद्वा इष्टं प्रयाजैः वीतमाप्रीभिः पयैर्गिनकृतं, but the MSS. are against it.

P. 234. l. 21. (162, 15.) अभिगूर्तं ये यजामह इत्यागूर्त्योक्तं ॥ अभिगूर्तं ये यजामह इत्याग्नेयुक्तं A. ये यजामह इत्यागूर्त्योक्तं B. ये यजामह इत्यागूर्त्युक्तं D. अभिगूर्तं ये यजामह इत्यागूर्त्युक्तं Ca.; lacuna in C. The reading of D. seems the best, and might have been adopted. The आगूः precedes the याज्या, याज्यादावागूर्ध्ववतीत्युक्तत्वात्.

P. 235. l. 7. (162, 16.) Instead of चात्त्राले (A. B. C. D.), Prof. Wilson proposes to read चत्त्राले. See verse 6.

P. 235. l. 16. (162, 17.) अर्थतोऽगमनं कुर्वन् A. C. दर्थतो गमनं कुर्वन् B. D.

P. 235. l. 17. (162, 17.) पाष्ण्यौ requires a gloss, पादाधोभागेन.

P. 235. l. 18. (162, 17.) यत् यस्मात् तस्मात्ते तव; left out in A. B. C., and supplied from D.

P. 236. l. 7. (162, 18.) इदमवद्यमिति A. Ca. इदमेवद्यमिति B. इदमद्यमिति C.? इदमवद्यमिति D.

P. 236. l. 14. (162, 19.) एकः । एक एव । स कः ॥ एक एव तत्स कः A. C. एकः एक एव तत्सकः B. एक एक एव स एकः D.

P. 237. l. 1. (162, 20.) भोगायतनत्वान्नव ॥ भोगाय तन्वः तव A. C. भोगाय तन्वस्तव B. भोगायत-  
नत्वान्नव D.

P. 237. l. 2. (162, 20.) वियोगजनिता D. व्योमजनिता A. B. C.

P. 237. l. 4. (162, 20.) केवलमांसग्रहणेऽप्युः D. केवलमांसग्रहणे A. B. C.

P. 238. l. 10. (162, 22.) समूहार्थे यत् A. B. C. D. According to Pāṇini it should be यः ।

P. 240. l. 9. (163, 3.) दुर्दिनरूपेण A. C. दुर्दिनेरूपेण B. D. has दुर्दिनरूपेण (दुर्दिनरूपेण?), which might seem preferable if it rested on the authority of MSS. The same applies to योगादिसाधन° (A. B. C.), instead of which D. has यागादिसाधन°.

P. 242. l. 6. (163, 6.) आदित्यमंडलादप्युपरिभूतैः A. and C. have पश्यानुपरिभूतैः, leaving out the whole sentence between. B. has preserved it, but reads प्रादित्यमंडलादित्युपरिभूतैः. D. reads आदित्यमंडलेष्वपरिभूतैः ।

P. 244. l. 15. (163, 10.) शीघ्रभावनाय D. श्रीः प्रभावनाय A. B. C.

P. 244. l. 24. (163, 10.) यदापुर्दिष्य° A. B. C. D. or यु. The Nirukta and its Commentary (Durga) have यदापुर्दिष्य°, which corresponds better with the Aorist आक्षिपुः ।

P. 246. l. 17. (164, 1.) द्विपंचाशद्वचं ॥ द्विपंचाशस्युचं A. B. C.; and again (p. 247. l. 18.) चत्वारिंशद्वचं ॥ चत्वारिंशस्युचं A. B. C.

P. 247. l. 21. (164, 1.) A. is wanting from 164, 1—164, 16 (p. 247—258).

P. 248. l. 21. (164, 1.) संख्यानि. The Brihad Āraṇyaka, from which this passage seems to have been taken, reads संख्यानि. Cf. Brih. Ār. p. 616.

P. 249. l. 2. (164, 1.) स्वरसत्त्वाभावात् B. Ca. B. in marg. प्रकण्वि रोधी instead of स्वर. प्रक-  
ण्विरसत्त्वान् ?.

P. 249. l. 15. (164, 2.) किं वस्तुतः सप्त Ca. sec. m. किंच वस्तुतः सप्त C. किंच स्तुतः सप्त B. Ca. pr. m.

P. 249. l. 27. (164, 2.) तिस्रो नाभिस्थानीयाः संध्याः संबद्धा वा त्रय चतुर्वो यस्य ॥ तिस्रो नाभिस्थानीयः  
संबंधानाद्ये ये चतुर्वो यस्य B 1. (तिस्रो संबंधानाद्यय° B 3.) तिस्रो नाभिस्थानीयाः संबद्धा वा त्रय चतुर्वो  
यस्य Ca. C.

P. 252. l. 8. (164, 5.) तत्कथंतीति Ca. C. तत्कर्षंतीति B.

P. 253. l. 6. (164, 6.) अवाङ्मनसगम्यं B. Ca. C.

P. 253. l. 8. (164, 6.) त्रिविधान् Ca. C. विविधान् B.

P. 253. l. 10. (164, 6.) अविशेषमस्तिनामात्रमेकरूप° ॥ अविशेषमस्तिगात्रमेकरूप° B. (न on the top  
of त्र in B 1.) अविशेषमस्तिनामात्रमेकरूप° Ca. C.

P. 254. l. 10. (164, 8.) हलमुखेन ॥ हलमुखे C. बलमुखे Ca. जलमुखे B. हलपुङ्क्तैः ?.

P. 254. l. 14. (164, 8.) सम्यगभिवृद्धानि सस्यानीति वचनं Ca. C. सम्यगभिदृष्ट्यैद्धानि रस्यानीति (सुवृष्टि  
marg.) वचनं ॥

P. 255. l. 24. (164, 11.) द्वादशसंख्याकमेधादिपश्यात्मकैर्वै औः रथांगवयवैर्वुक्ते B. C. The words  
द्वादशसंख्याकमेधादिपश्यात्मकैर्वै seem to be a later addition, inserted in the wrong place.  
The original reading was probably द्वादशसंख्याकैर् रथांगवयवैर्वुक्ते, and after this the  
words द्वादशसंख्याकमेधादिपश्यात्मकैर्वै were to be added.

P. 256. l. 16. (164, 12.) परायत्तं Ca. परीयतं B. C.

P. 257. l. 5. (164, 13.) आ तस्युः is not explained in B. or C. except by वर्तत इत्यर्थः. As इत्यर्थः is generally preceded by a more literal explanation, it is likely that the omission is owing to the copyists, and not, as in other cases, to Sáyana himself.

P. 259. l. 5. (164, 16.) लक्ष्णोऽस्ति स ई ॥ लक्ष्णोऽस्ति सः स ई B. लक्ष्णस्ति स ई C. लक्ष्णस्ति स ई A. लक्ष्णस्ति स ई Ca. sec. m. (ये pr. m.)

P. 259. l. 9. (164, 16.) लौकिकोक्तिरियं B. लौकिकोऽग्निरयं A. Ca. sec. m. (रि pr. m.) लौकिको निरियं C.

P. 259. l. 23. (164, 16.) इत्युपक्रम्य—मंत्रकृदिति B. A. and C. enlarge on this passage, as happens frequently in quotations from Bráhmaṇas. After उपक्रम्य, A. has first ते, which belonged probably to ते देवानपृच्छत, and then, after repeating the words from शिशुवीगिरसो to आमन्त्रयत, A. goes on तं पितरोऽब्रुवन्नधर्मं करोषि etc. C. agrees with A. except that तं पितरोऽब्रुवन् follows at once after उपक्रम्य. In Ca. the words from शिशुवी to स उज्जुजयति stand in the margin. A. Ca. and B. have मंत्रप्रद्रुः, C. मंत्रद्रुः. The whole passage from the Tāṇḍya-bráhmaṇa (13, 3.) is this: शिशुवी आंगिरसो मंत्रकृतं मंत्रकृदासीत् । स पितृन् पुत्रका इत्यामन्त्रयत् । तं पितरोऽब्रुवन्नधर्मं करोषि यो नः पितृन्मृतः पुत्रका इत्यामन्त्रयस इति । सोऽब्रवीदहं वाव पितास्मि यो मंत्रकृदसीति । ते देवानपृच्छत (देवेषुपृ) । ते देवा अब्रुवन् एष वाव पिता यो मंत्रकृदिति तद्वै स उज्जयत् ॥ See also Manu II. 151.

P. 261. l. 15. (164, 19.) चक्रपुः कृतवन्तौ तानि; these words are omitted in all the MSS.

P. 262. l. 8. (164, 20.) जीवादस्यो जीवाश्रयणात् B. जीवादस्यो ना जीवाश्रयणात् A. Ca. जीवादस्यो ता जीवाश्रयणात् C. If जीवादस्यो be the right reading, we should perhaps also read जीवात्मा परमात्मनोऽन्यः. A. Ca. and B. however have नान्यः, and C. also has न्यन्यः.

P. 262. l. 10. (164, 20.) वास्तवभेदं चापे° C. वास्तवभेदं वापे° B. वास्तवभेदं चापे° Ca. A.

P. 262. l. 23. (164, 20.) अनीश्या Ca. correct. C. अशनीया A. (शनीया Ca.) ऽनीया B.: cf. Muṇḍaka Upanishad III. 2.

P. 263. l. 6. (164, 20.) न च तद्वावा नासो तन्म° A. Ca. C. न च तदा वात्मान्यो B. न च तद्वावान्यत् is not likely to have been the original reading, but neither तद्वावादस्यः nor तद्वावनासोः would be much better.

P. 264. l. 5. (164, 21.) मदस्यः A. C. deest in B.

P. 264. l. 8. (164, 21.) परमात्माभूवं ॥ परमात्मा भूतं A. Ca. B. परमात्मभूतं C.

P. 266. l. 9. (164, 23.) शोसावोमिति etc. In explanation of these sacrificial formulæ B. 1. gives the following marginal notes: होता प्रातःसवने शोसावोमिति मंत्रेणाध्वर्युमाह्वयते । तस्यायमर्थः । हे अध्वर्यो शोसावः शंसनं कुर्वतः । ओमित्यनुज्ञार्थं । त्वयानुज्ञा देयेषुक्तं भवति । सोऽयं व्यक्षरो मंत्रः । ततोऽध्वर्युः शंसामोदैवोमिति पंचाक्षरेण प्रतिगृह्णाति । उत्तरं ब्रूयात् । तस्यायमर्थः । होतस्त्वं शंसनं कुरु । तद्वामोदैव । हवै एवास्माकं । अतोऽनुज्ञा दत्ता । तदेतन्मंत्रद्वयं मिलित्वाष्टाक्षरं संपद्यते । एवमुत्तरत्र ज्ञेयं । होता शस्त्रं पठित्वा उक्थं वाचीति चतुरक्षरं मंत्रं ब्रूयात् । मदीयायां वाचि संपद्ये । तस्यार्थः । ततोऽध्वर्युरेमुक्थशा इति चतुरक्षरं मंत्रं ब्रूयात् । ओमित्यंगीकारे । उक्थशास्त्वं शस्त्रशंसी भवसीत्यर्थः । तदेतन्मंत्रद्वयं मिलित्वाष्टाक्षरं संपद्यते । In the Commentary on Áśvaláyana the following explanation is given: शोसावेति शंसावेत्यर्थः । स एव प्रणवांतः शोसावोमिति पठ्यते ॥ शोसासो दैविति प्रतिगरो भवति । शंसासो दैवोमिति वा ॥



P. 266. l. 23. (164, 23.) एतदेवैकादशाक्षरं भवति ॥ एतदेवावशाक्षरं भवति A. C. एतदेवादश (द्वा over द) B. The next sentence from अथर्व्यु° to भवति is left out in A. and C. It is not clear how the words of the Hotri can be said to contain eleven syllables except by allowing for Vaidik productions; the words are the same in Áśvaláyana V. 50.

From 164, 24. to the end of the hymn A. is wanting (p. 267—291).

P. 267. l. 13. (164, 24.) एकस्यामृच्यारूढं ॥ एकस्यामृच्यगूढं Ca. C. एकस्यामृच्यागूढं B.

P. 269. l. 6. (164, 26.) यद्धर्म इत्यपत् ॥ यद्धां इत्यपत् B. यद्धर्म इत्यपत् Ca. C.

P. 269. l. 7. (164, 26.) तत्तद्देशोऽभीष्टः C. तत्तद्देशोऽभीष्टः B. Ca.

P. 270. l. 24. (164, 28.) प्रतिपादनभेदाद् Ca. प्रतिभादनभेदाद् C. प्रतिभेदनभेदाद् B.

P. 271. l. 10. (164, 29.) बालकस्यादनस्तनपानादि° ॥ बालकस्याज्जन° Ca. (ज्य° C.) बालकस्यार्जुनपा-  
नादि° B.

P. 271. l. 27. (164, 29.) एकवश्रयणेन वा Ca. C. एकवश्रयणेन वा B.

P. 272. l. 21. (164, 30.) The line which the MSS. give here might perhaps be placed before जीवस्य चैलक्षस्यमाह (p. 273. l. 3).

P. 273. l. 1. (164, 30.) B. explains एजत् by a marginal note एजु कंपने.

P. 273. l. 2. (164, 30.) अथैतेषां ॥ अथैतेव Ca. pr. m. C. अथैते B., and in marg. एषः. It should be अथैते च; and this seems to be intended by some indistinct corrections in Ca.

P. 277. l. 4. (164, 36.) महदहंकारौ ॥ मदाकारौ C. मदाहंकारौ Ca. महकारौ B. प्रकृति being written over it.

P. 277. l. 5. (164, 36.) अविकृतिरूपाया विकाराश्रयाया मूलप्रकृतेः ॥ अविकृतिरूपाः विकाराश्रयायाः मूल-  
प्रकृतौ Ca. C. अविकृतिरूपा विकाराश्रयाः मूलप्रकृतौ B. The words अविकृतिरूपा विकाराश्रयाः cannot be applied in their technical sense to the महदाद्याः प्रकृतिविकृतयः सप्तः, but only to the मूलप्रकृतिरविकृतिः. The genitive is better than the locative on account of the following च. In a wider sense अविकृतिरूपाः might be taken as an explanation of अङ्गैर्गर्भाः.

P. 277. l. 17. (164, 37.) After अनुगतोऽस्मि, B. has अस्मि भाति प्रियमिति; Ca. reads अनुगतो  
स्मि भातिप्रियमिति, C. भातिप्रियमिति, which is unintelligible. भावतयमिति or भावितमिति is not satisfactory.

P. 277. l. 22. (164, 37.) तदनस्यत्वमारंभणशब्दादिभ्य इति Ca. B. C. has आरंभणशब्दा°, but आरंभण  
is the reading of the Vedānta-sūtras, II. 1, 15.

P. 277. l. 24. (164, 37.) यदि व यत्परोक्ष° ॥ यदि वा यदापरोक्षज्ञानं C. B. (ज्ञा corrected in Ca.)

P. 277. l. 24. (164, 37.) After परोक्षज्ञानं, B. leaves out the words from ज्ञानं to ज्ञानं.  
C. has तदिह ॥ तद्वदेवमस्मि इदं सर्वमहमस्मीति ज्ञानं (तदिह Ca.)

P. 278. l. 24. (164, 38.) स्थानः । यत्न ॥ स्थानतय Ca. C. स्थानतय B., and in marg. अवस्थातय.

P. 279. l. 7. (164, 38.) सात्त्विकजातेः । त° ॥ स च्छत्विजाते त° B. स च्छत्विजातेः त° Ca. C.

P. 284. l. 16. (164, 44.) छेदनेन नापितकार्यं ॥ छेदनेनापि तत्कार्यं C. B. छेदनं नापितकार्यं Ca., which  
would have been adopted, if the MSS. had been then at hand.

P. 285. l. 3. (164, 45.) परिमिता ॥ वाक्यपरिमिता B. वाक्यपरिमिता Ca. C.

P. 285. l. 17. (164, 45.) याज्ञिकैः समास्तातोऽनुष्ठेयार्थप्रकाशको वेदभागो मन्त्राः । मन्त्रविधानं ॥ याज्ञिकैः समा-  
ख्यातो नुष्ठेयार्थं प्रकाशादिमन्त्रविधानं Ca. याज्ञिकैः समाख्यातौ नुष्ठेयार्थं प्रकाशादिमन्त्रविधानं C. याज्ञिकैः समा-  
ख्यातोऽनुष्ठेयार्थं प्रकाशादिमन्त्रविधानं B1. (ष्ठेयार्थं B 3.) All the MSS. have mixed the explana-  
tion of the Mantra with that of the Kalpa; the former is अनुष्ठेयार्थप्रकाशक, the  
latter मन्त्रविधानप्रतिपादक. The quotation इति मन्त्राः कस्योऽत ऊर्द्धं is of frequent occurrence  
in the Brāhmanas. B 1. takes it as a quotation from a Sūtra, and has in the  
margin सूत्र प्रथमाध्याय खं०४. Some of the Sūtras differ very little from the Brāhmanas,  
and some Brāhmanas contain considerable portions written in the style of  
Sūtras. Thus Kumārila says, चारुणपरशरशाखाब्राह्मणस्य कल्परूपत्वं. Śāyana, in his Intro-  
duction to the Aitareya-brāhmaṇa, writes कल्पस्वारुणकेतुकचयनप्रकरणे समाधायते । इति मन्त्राः  
कस्योऽत ऊर्द्धं यदि बलिं हरेदिति. See Prolegomena, p. 144.

P. 286. l. 1. (164, 45.) वाच्यस्य B. खाख्यस्य C. रवाख्यस्य Ca.

P. 288. l. 6. (164, 48.) नाभ्यरिहाणि. This is the reading of the MSS., which may be  
meant for नाभ्यभिधानि or नभ्याभिधानि; but the cerebral *n* seems to point to something  
else: cf. Pāṇ. IV. 2, 80.

P. 291. l. 19. (165, 1.) The quotation from the Rig-vidhāna required some altera-  
tions. A. (which begins again with this hymn) has कया शुभेति पैशून्यं श्रुत्वा चायं नृपद्विजां;  
C. has कया शुभेति पशून्यं श्रुत्वा चायं नृपद्विजां (Ca. पै°); while the text of the Rig-vidhāna is  
in one MS. कया शुभेति पाशून्यं कृत्वा चायं नृपद्विजैः, in the other कया शुभेति पैशून्यं कृत्वाचायंनृपद्विजैः.

P. 295. l. 8. (165, 7.) यद्यस्यैव तत्तस्यैव भवतु । तर्ह्येहं ॥ यद्यस्यैव तर्ह्येहं A. C. अद्यस्यैव तर्ह्येहं B.

P. 297. l. 16. (165, 12.) मत्कृतैः ॥ त्वत्कृतैः A. B. C. It might be मत्कृतैः or युष्मत्कृतैः.

P. 302. l. 12. (166, 6.) विषेपणशीलं दंती ॥ विषेपणशीलं दती C. विक्लेपणशीतदेति A. Ca. विषे-  
पणशीलं दंती B.

P. 309. l. 5. From 167, 4—171, 6. A. is wanting (p. 309—328).

P. 315. l. 13. (168, 4.) After अपापाः, Ca. C. give quite a different explanation to the  
end of the verse: अपापाः समुदनेन पांसु विचुः व्यावयंति । चालयंति ॥ It seems to refer to अरेणवः,  
but the text is corrupt.

P. 323. l. 19. (170, 1.) नैव नास्ति B. Ca. C.

P. 324. l. 3. (170, 2.) अस्माननपराधिनः B. अस्मानपराधिनः Ca. C.

P. 327. l. 10. (171, 3.) Between इदं and मुखयंतु B. and Ca. C. have ययं.

P. 327. l. 20. (171, 4.) अस्माननपराधिनः. B. and Ca. C. have अस्मानपराधिनः.

P. 330. l. 16. (173, 2.) खेदुहयैः स्वायत्तेद्विष्कैः । यद्वा स्वयं प्राप्तेधकं हयं येषां B. खेदुहयैः स्वायत्तेद्वि-  
ष्कैः । यद्वा स्वयंप्राप्तेदू उदकं हयं येषां A. Ca. C.

P. 333. l. 3. (173, 6.) वृजनमिव । वृजनेः कर्तनार्थस्येदं रूपं B. वृजनमिव च मे वृजनेः कर्तनार्थस्येदं  
रूपं A. C.

P. 333. l. 17. (173, 7.) निमित्तेऽर्थे ॥ निमित्तेऽर्थे A. B. C.

P. 333. l. 18. (173, 7.) प्रयतंते ॥ प्रयंत इति A. B. C.

P. 335. l. 21. (173, 11.) तत्सवनं ॥ तत्सह A. C. तत्सदनं B.

P. 336. l. 10. (173, 12.) योत्स्यामीति B. नोऽस्मभ्यमीति A. C.

P. 338. l. 1. (174, 2.) कातरयत्नानिंदावन् ॥ कातरयत्नानिंदावन् B. कातरयत्नानिंदान A. C.

P. 338. l. 2. (174, 2.) तटाकादीनि ॥ तयदकादीनि A. B. C.

P. 338. l. 22. (174, 3.) वस्तोर्वस्तु ॥ वस्ता वस्तु B. वस्तोः वस्तु A. C.

P. 338. l. 24. (174, 3.) यागाद्यनुष्ठानपरः स्यास्यामीत्यर्थः ॥ यागाद्यनुष्ठानपुर स्यास्यामीत्यर्थः B. यागाद्यनुष्ठानपरास्याम्यामीत्यर्थः A. C.

P. 340. l. 13. (174, 6.) सचा सह शूताः क्षिप्रा हविःप्रदानेन त्वयापत्वं B. त्वया सह शूताः क्षिप्रा हविःप्रदानेन तथा अपत्वं A. C. The construction is wrong in both cases, unless we read वहमानाः संति instead of वहमाना ये संति ते प्रपश्यन्. Perhaps वहमानाः संति was the original reading, and ये प्रपश्यन् ते was added as a new sentence: or वाहमानाः । वाहमाना ये संति ते प्रपश्यन्.

P. 340. l. 16. (174, 6.) क्षिप्रा वर्जिताः ॥ क्षिप्रा वर्जिताः A. B. C.

P. 341. l. 25. (174, 9.) From here to 180, 7. (p. 360.) A. is wanting.

P. 346. l. 21. (176, 2.) ब्रीह्यादिकमुप्यते Ca. C. ब्रीह्यादिकमुप्यते B.

P. 351. l. 12. (178, 1.) श्रुतयः B. Ca. C. It ought to be श्रुतीः, unless the whole sentence is taken as a parenthesis. Cf. Rv. vol. III. p. 191. l. 13.

P. 352. l. 21. (178, 4.) तथैव ॥ यथैव B. Ca. C.

P. 355. l. 15. (179, 4.) निमित्तात्कामात् । निमित्तासंतः कामात्कथं B. निमित्ताः संतः कामात्कथं Ca. C.

P. 355. l. 26. (179, 5.) The first part of this verse has been lost in the Commentary; none of the MSS. have preserved it. The words अस्मिन्पक्षे etc. however, towards the end of the verse, seem to indicate that Śāyana had given before an explanation of the words हस्तु पीतं. In the same verse (p. 356. l. 5.) B. has यद्वा यमपवर्जनीयतया, Ca. C. यद्वा यामपवर्जनीयतया. Again, instead of कामहतः सन् कामेन निरुद्ध एव, Ca. C. have कामहतः सन् नमिननिरुद्ध एव, and B. कामहतः सनः कामिननिरुद्ध एव.

P. 357. l. 9. (180, 1.) दीयति तक्तीति ॥ दीयति टक्तीति Ca. C. दीयति तप्तीति B.: cf. Nigh. II. 14.

P. 357. l. 9. (180, 1.) त्वदागमनकाले B. C.

P. 358. l. 2. (180, 2.) रथं प्राप्नुय इत्यर्थः ॥ रथं वाप्रप इत्यर्थः Ca. C. रथं वा अय इत्यर्थः B.

P. 359. l. 2. (180, 4.) तन्नघर्मेसकाशात् Ca. C. न पूर्वं घर्मेसकाशात् B.

P. 360. l. 1. (180, 5.) सर्वप्रदेशव्यापित्वं ॥ सर्वप्रदेशवाचित्वं B. सर्वप्रदेशवाचित्वं Ca. C.

P. 361. l. 18. (180, 8.) After स इव all the MSS. have मध्ये. Either a whole sentence has been dropped, to which मध्ये belonged (संग्राममध्ये), or it was meant to follow after तेषु; तेषु मध्ये प्रयत्नः ॥

P. 362. l. 1. (180, 9.) वहतः A. B. C., instead of वहयः; a transition from the second to the third person, not unusual in Śāyana.

P. 362. l. 4. (180, 9.) कर्मणि निवृत्ते पुनरपगच्छति ॥ कर्मण्यपवृत्ते पुनर्निगच्छति A. B. C.

P. 365. l. 12. (181, 5) अन्यतमस्य A. B. C., instead of अन्यतरस्य, which would be more correct.

P. 365. l. 23. (181, 6.) वर्धिता एवेन्द्रः ॥ वर्धिता देवेन्द्रः A. C. वर्धिता देवेन्द्रः B.

P. 366. l. 21. (181, 8.) स्तुतिवाक् Ca. C. B. स्तुतिवीक् A. Ca. sec. m. स्तुतिरूपा वाक्?.

P. 367. l. 1. (181, 8.) शांतनात्सेक उदकस्यैव ॥ शांतनात्सेके उदकस्यैव A. Ca. शांतनात्सेके उदके उदकस्यैव

B. शान्तनास्तेके उदकस्येव C. शान्तनात् is probably a mistake ; it may be meant for शान्तवनात् ('because there is comfort, as if water was sprinkled') or for आप्यायनात् ('because there is growth'); but neither of the two emendations is probable.

P. 367. l. 8. (181, 9.) From here to 188, 6. A. is wanting. The Commentary from 184, 1. to 185, 5, however, is found in A 2. at the beginning of the seventh Adhyāya.

P. 368. l. 6. (182, 1.) पालयितृधनौ C. पालायतृधनौ B.

P. 370. l. 2. (182, 5.) प्रसादफलकराश्विनौ B. प्रसादफलकराश्विनौ Ca. रोश्चि° C.

P. 373. l. 2. (183, 3.) यजमानाय दत्तहविषा तद्वान् B. Ca. C. यजमानदत्तहविषा तद्वान् seems to be a necessary correction.

P. 381. l. 24. (185, 6.) वृष्ट्यादेः देवानां Ca. C. वृष्ट्या देवानां B.

P. 382. l. 24. (185, 8.) तयोरश्विन्यादिवहुमननासंभवादुचितमेव ॥ तयोरश्विन्यादिवहुमननासंभवादुचितमेव B. तयोरश्विन्यादिवहुमनननासंभवादुचितमेव Ca. C. There is a mistake in this line, which the reading adopted in the text does not remove.

P. 386. l. 15. (186, 4.) सर्वदैव वेत्यर्थः ॥ सर्वदैववार्थः B. सर्वदेववार्थः Ca. C.

P. 389. l. 1. (186, 9.) उत्पादयन्ति ॥ उत्पादयन्तु B. C.

P. 389. l. 2. (186, 9.) सर्वनामवृणोति B. Ca. C. (सर्वी ग्रामावृणोति or सर्वमाशृणाति?) line 3. मरुत्सेना अवृष्ट्या B. Ca. C. करोति B. करोतु Ca. C.

P. 390. l. 4. (187, 1.) In Sāyana's quotation from Śaunaka's Rig-vidhāna there are several readings differing from the MSS. of the Rig-vidhāna: भुञ्जीत स्रविकुत्सयन् B. भुञ्जीत स्रविकुत्सयन् Ca., but corrected into भुञ्जीयादविकुत्सितं, which probably would be found to be the reading of A. if a new A. MS. should be discovered. The MS. of the Rig-vidhāna, E. I. H. 1732 a. has भुञ्जीयादविकुत्सितं; 1732 b. has भुञ्जीयादविकुत्सितं. Again, विषमप्यन्तं भवेत् B. C.; but Ca. corrected (= A.) has विषमप्यन्तमियात्, which is the reading of Rig-vidhāna 1732 b., while 1732 a. has अमृतामियात्. Instead of नावाग्यतस्तु, which is the reading of MSS. 1732 a. b., B. has वक्तव्यमेव भुञ्जीत, C. वक्तव्याय च भुञ्जीत, corrected into न वक्तव्याय.

P. 393. l. 15. (187, 9.) All the MSS. are so defective in this verse, that it is impossible to complete the sentence except by conjecture. B. reads हे सोम ते तव यत् यमंशं गवाशिरः गोविकारः क्षीराद्याश्रयणद्वया यवाशिरः यवविकाराश्रय शरीर पीवो वभ ॥ Ca. has हे सोम ते तव यत् यमंशं गवाशिरः गोविकारक्षीराद्याश्रयणद्वया यवाशिरः गोविकारक्षीराद्याश्रय शरीर पीवो भव । This has been corrected by marginal notes. First, after the last अ, ए was put in, which, however, must have been meant to come in after अय; then this ए was blotted out, and a whole line put in after the same letter, एद्वया यवशिरः गोविकारक्षीराद्याश्रय. The *ā* of द्वया is again cancelled, and the whole emendation is erroneous, as it could only have been meant for यवविकाराश्रयण. But even after this there is no construction in the Commentary, and it is not clear even whether the Commentator referred गवाशिरः and यवाशिरः to भजामहे or to ते. To judge from the MSS., Sāyana seems to have taken these words as accusatives dependant on

यत् or यमंशं. In this case we might read हे सोम ते तव यत् यमंशं गवाशिरो गोविकारस्त्रीराद्याश्र-  
पणद्वयं यवाशिरो यवविकाराश्रपणद्वयं भजामहे सेवामहे तेन हे वातापे शरीर-पीवो भव । The proper  
commentary, however, would be this; हे सोम ते तव यत् यमंशं भजामहे सेवामहे । कीदृशस्य तव ।  
गवाशिरः । गोविकारस्त्रीरादिमिश्रितस्य । यवाशिरः । यवैर्मिश्रितस्य च । तेन इत्यादि । मिश्रित is the usual  
explanation, although आशिर is derived from श्रीन्. See II. 22, 1. यवाशिरं यवमयैः सक्तुभिर्मि-  
श्रितं । आङ्पूर्वस्य श्रीणतेः क्षिपि अयस्पृधेयामित्यादिना शिर इत्यादेशः.

P. 393. l. 21. (187, 10.) In this verse again B. leaves out करंभो यः, Ca. reads करंभयः,  
and leaves out all between ओषधे त्वं पी° and °द्यो गतः ॥

P. 397. l. 6. (188, 9.) Before रेतसः, Ca. C. and B. have the words यावन्नो वै (यावको वै?).

P. 399. l. 14. (189, 2.) Ca. has a marginal note with regard to शं योः । यौतेविच् । गुणः ।  
यो । सुः । इति भट्टभास्करः. Bhaṭṭabhāskara wrote a Vedabhāshya (cf. Devarāja's Com-  
mentary on the Nirukta), and another grammatical Commentary on the Pari-  
bhāshās (cf. Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays, p. 42). He is quoted by Sāyana,  
I. 63, 4. I. 71, 4. I. 84, 15, &c.

P. 400. l. 16. (189, 5.) इत्यनयाशमभिनुहोति Ca. इत्यनयाशमभिनुहोति B. आशयं is explained  
as यस्मिन्नाज्ये पुरोडाशः शायितस्तदाशयं.

P. 401. l. 7. (189, 6.) The MSS. read विष्पट्, but, as no etymology is given, and as  
the word does not occur again in the Rig-veda, it is difficult to say whether it  
be meant for विष्पट् or विष्पट्.

P. 402. l. 12. (190, 1.) From 190, 1. to 191, 4. the Commentary of A 2. is found  
again at the beginning of the seventh Adhyāya.

P. 403. l. 15. (190, 2.) सर्वे भवन्ति A. B. C. सर्वे यक्ता भवन्ति?.

P. 405. l. 18. (190, 6.) हे बहस्यते B. हे ब्राह्मणस्यते A. Ca.

P. 407. l. 3. (191, 1.) अमृणसूर्यैः. Shadguruśishya has the following note: अमृणाति  
सूर्यश्चात्र देवता । अमृणसूर्यमिति ग्राम उच्चरपदवृद्धिश्चादसी ।

P. 411. l. 12. (191, 10.) The Pada-text has सः । चित् ।, but the Commentator explains  
it as सः । ऊं इति । चित् ।, while in the next verse the Pada gives सो इति instead of  
सा । ऊं इति ॥

P. 412. l. 10. (191, 11.) विषहन्ती A. C. विषहंती B.

P. 412. l. 12. (191, 11.) यद्देहावृत्तविषं तस्य शुक्रोन्म्यः आदित्याप्रदानसमस्तीयुक्तं भवति B. यद्देहावृत्तविषं तस्य  
शुक्रोन्म्यः आदित्याप्रदानसमस्तीयुक्तं भवति A. C. Both readings are evidently inaccurate; but,  
not knowing the character and style of the work from which this quotation is  
taken, I find it impossible to propose a more satisfactory reading.

P. 412. l. 23. (191, 12.) सूक्ष्मचटिका ॥ सूक्ष्मचटिका B. सूक्ष्मचटिका A. C.

P. 414. l. 4. (191, 15.) यावद्विषामगमं तं पाषाणानुयातमनुतिष्ठति तद्विदः ॥ यावद्विषामगमं पाषाणमनु-  
तिष्ठति तद्विदः B. यावद्विषामगमं तं पाषाणमनुयातमनुतिष्ठति तद्विदः A. यावद्विषामगमं तं पाषाणमनुयातमनु-  
तिष्ठति तद्विदः Ca. pr. m. यावद्विषामगमं तं पाषाणमनुयातमनुतिष्ठति तद्विदः C.

Some of the MSS. of the Sanhitā-text contain a number of hymns, or some-  
times single verses, which are not explained by Sāyana, and did not form part

of what the Brahmans consider the canonical text of the Rig-veda. They are called 'Khila,' and in some MSS. 'Pariśiṣṭa.' I have never met with them in the Pada-text of the Rig-veda, and some of the Sanhitā MSS. also omit them. Still some of them may claim a considerable antiquity; and though they are not included in the index of the hymns ascribed to Kātyāyana, there can be no doubt that they were known to Kātyāyana's predecessor, Śaunaka, who was the author of several Anukramanīs to the Rig-veda. He mentions the Khilas in general in the introduction to his Anuvāka-anukramaṇī:

एकैकमनुवाकं तु खिलानि ब्राह्मणानि च । संवत्सरे संवत्सरे पठेद्दहः शुचिः ॥

Again, in the third verse of the same Anukramaṇī, between the 13th and 14th Anuvāka of the first Maṇḍala, Śaunaka states distinctly that he does not enumerate the Khailika Anuvākas:

खैलिकानामनादेशोऽस्मिन् ग्रंथेऽनुवाकानां । यस्तु चर्चयते वेदे तस्य संख्येति न श्रुतिः ॥<sup>a</sup>

Where the number of the Anuvākas, of the Sūktas, the Vargas, the verses, the metres, and of the single words in the Rig-veda is given by Śaunaka (the words amount to 153826), the Khilas are never taken into account. But the very fact that they were not counted by Śaunaka, and that he himself says so, shows that they existed in his time. The number of hymns in the Śākala-śākhā is 1017, but, as Śaunaka says, exclusive of the Khilas: सहस्रेतत्सूक्तानां निश्चितं खैलिकैर्विना दश सप्त च पठ्यन्ते. The Bāshkala-śākhā, according to Śaunaka, contained eight-hymns more, but again, as he says, exclusive of Khilas: एतत्सहस्रं दश सप्त चैव अष्टावन्तो बाष्कलकेऽधिकानि । तान्पारखे शाकले जैशिरये<sup>b</sup> वदन्ति शिष्टा न खिलेषु विप्राः ॥ Another proof of the antiquity of these Khila-hymns consists in their being quoted in the Nirukta<sup>c</sup>. In Pāṇini the Khilas are not mentioned except in the Gaṇa-pāṭha. Some of the verses which are Khilas in the Rig-veda occur in the text of the Ātharvaṇa. In the Vājasaneyi-sanhitā several entire Adhyāyas are called Khila (XXVI—XXXV), and even in the latest works of the Vaidik period, in the Āraṇyakas and Upanishads, some portions are still marked as apocryphal. The 7th and 8th Adhyāya of the Bṛihadāraṇyaka are called Khila and Pariśiṣṭa in the Commentary (p. 948. ed. Roer), and the whole Yājñikī Upanishad is called by the same name. In the epic poem of the Mahābhārata the Harivaṇśa is reckoned as a Khila.

As I did not insert the Khila-hymns in the printed text of the Rig-veda, I shall give them in the notes at the end of each Maṇḍala. They generally occur

<sup>a</sup> This is the original reading, which has afterwards been changed into खैलिकानामनादेशोऽनुवाकानामिह स्मृतः. The Commentary adds, अतोऽत्रोक्तानि खिलवर्जमुच्यन्त इति भावः । In

Śaunaka's Arshanukramaṇī the Khilas seem to have been mentioned.

<sup>b</sup> जैशिरया इति पठन्त्ये ।

<sup>c</sup> Cf. Roth, Abhandlungen, p. 34.

at the end of Maṇḍalas and Anuvākas, not of Asṭakas and Adhyāyas, another proof of the early date of their insertion.

At the end of the 9th Anuvāka of the first Maṇḍala the MS. of the E. I. H. 129. (S 3.) gives a Khila. It is counted as the 9th Varga, but in order to adjust the numbers the 20th Varga is counted twice. It does not occur in S 1. and S 2., nor in MSS. Bodl. Wilson 429, 435, 443.

ज्ञानैश्चित्सूर्येण आदित्येन सहीयसा । अहं यशस्विनां यशो विद्यारूपाया ददे ॥  
उद्यन्नद्यमिनो भज पिता पुत्रेभ्यो यथा । दीर्घायुत्वस्य हेशिषे तस्य नो धेहि सूर्ये ॥  
उद्यंतं त्वा मित्रमहं आरोहंतं विचक्षण । पश्येम शरदः शतं जीवेम शरदः शतं ॥

These verses are not to be found either in the Rig, Sāma, Yajur, or Atharva-veda.

At the end of the first Maṇḍala S 1. and S 3. give another Khila. It is not found in S 2., nor in MSS. Bodl. Wilson 429, 435. The accents are given in S 1., but by a person not very conversant with Vaidik grammar.

मा विभेनं मरिष्यसि परि त्वा पामि सर्वतः । घनेन हन्मि वृश्चिकमहं दंडेनागतं ॥  
आदित्यरथवेगेन विष्णुबाहुबलेन च । गरुडपक्षनिपातेन भूमिं गच्छ महार्यशाः ॥  
गरुडस्य जातमात्रेण त्रयो लोकाः प्रकंपिताः । प्रकंपिता मही सर्वा सशैलवचनकानना ॥  
गगनं नष्टचंद्राकं ज्योतिषं न प्रकाशते । देवतां <sup>d</sup>भयभीताश्च मारुतो न प्रवायन्ति <sup>e</sup>मारुतो न प्रवायन्तो नमः ॥  
भो सपै भद्रं भद्रं ते दूरं गच्छ महाविषाः । <sup>f</sup>जनमेजयस्य यज्ञाति आस्तीकवचनं स्मर ॥  
आस्तीकवचनं श्रुत्वा यः सपौ न निवर्तते । शतधा भिद्यते मूर्ध्नि शिशुवृक्षफलं यथा ॥

The first of these verses, as my friend Dr. Aufrecht informs me, occurs in the Atharvāna X. 4, 9, though with considerable changes :

अरसा इहाहयो ये अंति ये च दूरके । घनेन हन्मि वृश्चिकमहं दंडेनागतं ॥

The two last verses occur in the Mahābhārata I. 2190, with some slight alterations :

सपौसपै भद्रं ते गच्छ सपै महाविष । जनमेजयस्य यज्ञाति आस्तीकवचनं स्मर ॥  
आस्तीकस्य वचः श्रुत्वा यः सपौ न निवर्तते । शतधा भिद्यते मूर्ध्नि शिशुवृक्षफलं यथा ॥

## Maṇḍala II.

At the beginning of the second Maṇḍala S 2. adds,

विश्वेश्वर विरूपाक्ष विश्वरूप सदाशिव । शरणं भव भूतेश करुणां कर शंभव ॥

P. 416. l. 4. (II. I, I.) यद्वा आशु शीघ्रं शुचं दीप्तः सन् यतः स सेव्यत इति ॥ यद्वा आशु शीघ्रं शुचा दीप्ता सन् यतः संसेव्यत इति A. C. यद्वा आशु शीघ्रं शुचं दीप्तः सन् यतः स सेव्यत इति B. Perhaps आशु शीघ्रं शुचा दीप्ता सम्यते सेव्यत इति.

<sup>d</sup> भयवितस्ता S 3.

<sup>e</sup> मारुतो न प्रवायन्तो नमः deest in S 3.

<sup>f</sup> जनमेज S 3.

P. 416. l. 17. (II. 1, 2.) A. is wanting from here to II. 5, 7; II. 1, 2—9, however, is found at the beginning of the seventh Adhyāya.

P. 426. l. 26. (II. 2, 5.) द्यौर्द्विलोकांतरिखं Ca. C. द्यौर्द्विलोके रिखं B.

P. 428. l. 1. (II. 2, 7.) After नशब्दश्चार्थे, B. adds प्रादयो र्थव्यवसायेन व्यवहरन्ति ॥

P. 430. l. 19. (II. 3, 1.) समिद्धोऽग्निरग्निना नरा° Ca. C. समिधाग्निनरा° B.

P. 437. l. 20. (II. 4, 4.) Instead of यद्वास्याग्नेः संबन्धिनी पुष्टिर्यथा यजमानविषया रखा तद्वत्, Ca. C. have यद्वास्याग्नेः संबन्धिनी तद्वत् यद्वास्याग्नेः संबन्धिनी पुष्टिर्यजमानविषया रखास्तस्याग्नेः पुष्टिर्यथा रखा तद्वत्.

P. 438. l. 26. (II. 4, 5.) यद्वा नभोभिः ॥ स यथा नभोभिः B. Ca. C.

P. 440. l. 22. (II. 5, 1.) प्रयच्छन्. The Pada has प्रयच्छन्, the Sanhitā प्रयच्छं जेन्मं; a final न् before palatals is written as Anusvāra in most Vaidik MSS.

P. 441. l. 2. (II. 5, 1.) यमं यमयितव्यं ॥ यमं यमेतव्यं B. Ca. C.

P. 441. l. 3. (II. 5, 1.) वाजिनोऽन्नस्य B. Ca. C.

P. 444. l. 26. (II. 6, 2.) स्तुत्युपवृंहितेन ॥ स्तुत्युपवृंहितेन A. B. C.

P. 446. l. 26. (II. 7, 1.) तेऽध्वर्यादिभिः ॥ ते अध्वर्यादिभिः A. B. C.

P. 447. l. 9. (II. 7, 2.) उभयविधाया द्विषः ॥ उभयविधायाः विद्विषः A. B. C.

P. 447. l. 9. (II. 7, 2.) पूरय A. C. पूरयः B. Although पर्षि is explained in some passages by पूरय (cf. Rv. I. 174, 9), it was probably meant for पालय in our verse. See also Rv. I. 129, 5.

P. 447. l. 14. (II. 7, 3.) धारा अत्यसुतीरिव त्मनात्मनैवान्यनिरपेक्षेण ॥ धारा असस्तुतीरिव त्मना आत्मनैव अन्यनिरपेक्षेण A. C. धारा असस्तुतीरिव त्मना आत्मनैव अन्यनिरपेक्षेण B. Sāyaṇa seems to have read त्मना instead of त्वया. अत्यसुतीः is merely conjectural, and not quite satisfactory because सुतिः is itself a Vaidik word. The whole may be a quotation, though this would hardly be in accordance with Sāyaṇa's usual style of interpretation.

P. 447. l. 15. (II. 7, 3.) अभिक्लम्य A. B. C.

P. 447. l. 26. (II. 7, 5.) सेकृभिः ॥ सेवभिः A. C. deest in B.

P. 452. l. 23. (II. 9, 4.) यद्वा मानयिता ॥ यद्वा मनोता A. B. Ca. has मनोता, but the C. MSS. have मानाता, which, as it does not occur in Ca., is evidently a mistake of the first copyist; o, according to the old spelling, being frequently mistaken for á + á.

P. 455. l. 17. (II. 10, 4.) There is an omission in all the MSS. towards the end of the Commentary. After घृतेन च we expect the verb जिहर्षि, which I have inserted to complete the sentence, but instead of which the MSS. give extracts from a Brāhmaṇa. In the usual style of Sāyaṇa such extracts would be preceded by तथा च ब्राह्मणं, while here all the MSS. begin at once and quite abruptly with the words प्रति श्लेष. Another irregularity is this, that the quotation from the Brāhmaṇa refers not only to this, but also to the following verse. A. reads घृतेन च प्रति श्लेष सर्वाणि भूतानि क्षेति पृथिव्या एष वयसा धूमेन वृहत् व्यचिष्टमै रभसं इशानमित्यनवकाशनवनमन्त्रैरवादी दीप्यमानमित्येतदा विश्वत इत्या सर्वतः प्रत्यंचं जुहोतीत्येतदस्त्रसेत्यहेलमानेन मनसेदं जुषेतेत्येतन्मयश्रीरिति मर्यश्रीरित्येष स्पृह्यद्वयौ अग्निर्ना-



भिमृश इति न शेष मृशेत दीप्यमानो भवतीति ॥ Ca. has घृतेन च प्रति शेष सर्वाणि भूतानि क्षेति पृथिव्या एष वयसा धूमेन बृहन् (sec. man. तं) व्यचिष्टमनै रभसं दृशानमित्यनवकाशनवनमनै (sec. man. नै) रत्नादं (sec. man. दी) दीप्यमानमित्येतदा विश्वत इत्या सर्वतं प्रत्यक्षं (दीप्यमानं struck out, but not in C.) जुहोती (मी C.) त्वेतदरक्षसेत्यहेलमामानेन मनसेदं जुषेतेत्येतन्मयश्रीरिति मयैश्रीरित्येष स्पृहयद्वर्णो अग्निर्नाभिमृश इति म (sec. man. न) शेष मृशेत दीप्यमानो भवतीति । The readings of the C. MSS. are the same as Ca. prima manu, with the exception of दीप्यमानं, which is left out in C., and म (sec. man. न), which is omitted. B. has घृतेन च प्रति शेष सर्वाणि भूतानि क्षेति पृथिव्या एष वयसा धूमेन बृहन् व्यचिष्टमनै रभसं दृशानमित्यनवकाशनवत्प्रमात्वरत्नादं दीप्यमानमित्येतदा विश्वत इत्या सर्वतः प्रत्यक्षं (sec. man. नृ) च जुहोमीत्येतदरक्षासत्यहेलमामानेन मसेदं जुषेतेत्येतन्मयश्रीरिति मयैश्रीरित्येष स्पृहयद्वर्णो अग्निर्नाभिमृशेति न शेष मृशेत दीप्यमानो भवतीति ॥ As it would have been difficult to restore the text from the MSS. of Sayana's Commentary, it was necessary to collate the Bráhmaṇas, in which these verses are explained. Now the hymn in question is recited by the Hotri as part of the Prátaranuváka. We might therefore expect to find Bráhmaṇa explanations in the corresponding part of the Aitareya-bráhmaṇa, II. 24—28. Here, however, no exegetical remarks are made on this particular hymn. As the Udgátri is not concerned with our hymn, we cannot expect to find an explanation of it in the Sáma-veda-bráhmaṇa. The Adhvaryu priest has to use the first two verses of our hymn in the first part of the Agnicayana sacrifice. These hymns, the Ukhásambharāṇa-mantras, are collected in the Taittirīya-sanhitá, IV. 1, and here accordingly we find our verse though slightly modified: जिघमिं ॥३॥ अग्निं मनसा घृतेन प्रति स्तुतं भुवनानि विश्वा । पृथुं तिरश्चा वयसा बृहन् व्यचिष्टमन्नं रभसं विदानं । आ त्वा जिघमिं वचसा घृतेनारक्षसा मनसा तज्जुषस्व । मयैश्रीः स्पृहयद्वर्णो अग्निर्नाभिमृशे तनुवा जर्ह्यराणः । The Bráhmaṇa to this is contained in the following, the fifth book of the Taittirīyakam (V. 1, 3, 2): जिघर्म्यग्निं मनसा घृतेनेत्याह । मनसा हि पुरुषो यज्ञमभिगच्छति ॥ प्रतिस्तुतं भुवनानि विश्वेत्याह । सर्वं शेष प्रत्यक्षं क्षेति ॥ पृथुं तिरश्चा वयसा बृहन्मित्याहास्यो शेष जातो महान् ॥२॥ भवति ॥ व्यचिष्टमन्नं रभसं विदानमित्याहान्नमेवासौ स्वदयति सर्वमसौ स्वदते य एवं वेदा त्वा जिघमिं वचसा घृतेनेत्याह । तस्माद्यापुरुषो मनसाभिगच्छति तद्वाचा वदत्यरक्षसेत्याह रक्षसामपहस्यै ॥ मयैश्रीः स्पृहयद्वर्णो अग्निरित्याहापचितिमेवासिन्धात्यपचितिमान्भवति य एवं ॥३॥ वेद मनसा त्वेतामाहुर्महंति यामध्वर्युरनग्नावाहुतिं जुहोति मनस्वतीभ्यां जुहोत्याहुतै द्वाभ्यां प्रतिष्ठित्यै etc. The last Veda which we can look to for a Bráhmaṇa explanation is the White Yajur-veda. Here we find the two verses in question as 23 and 24 in the eleventh book of the Vájasaneyi-sanhitá, again with slight modifications. The corresponding Bráhmaṇa ought to be in the Ukhásambharāṇa of the Śatapatha-bráhmaṇa, and here indeed we meet with explanations very similar to those given by Sáyana. Prap. 3. Bráhm. 1. Kaṇḍiká 19. we read, आ त्वा जिघमिं मनसा घृतेनेति । आ त्वा जुहोमि मनसा च घृतेन चेत्येतत् ॥ प्रतिक्षिप्यतं भुवनानि विश्वेति । प्रत्यक्षं शेष सर्वाणि भुवनानि क्षिपयति ॥ पृथुं तिरश्चा वयसा बृहन्तमिति पृथुवा एष तिवैक्ष वयसा बृहन् धूमेन व्यचिष्टमनै रभसं दृशानमित्यनवकाशवन्तमन्नै रत्नादं दीप्यमानमित्येतत् ॥१९॥ आ विश्वतः प्रत्यक्षं जिघमीत्या सर्वतः प्रत्यक्षं जुहोम्येतदरक्षसा मनसा तज्जुषेतेत्यहेलमामानेन मनसा तज्जुषेतेत्येतन्मयैश्रीः स्पृहयद्वर्णोऽग्निर्नाभिमृशे तन्वा जर्ह्यराण इति न शेषोऽभिमृशे तन्वा दीप्यमानो भवति ॥ Although this is the Bráhmaṇa which Sáyana must have had in his mind when

he wrote his Commentary, it is difficult to account for the differences between the original text and his quotation, unless we suppose him to have quoted from another Sākhā of the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa. There is no MS. of the Ukhā-sambharāṇa according to the Kāṇva-śākhā in Europe. As it was impossible, therefore, to restore the original reading, I have left the quotation as it stands in Śāyana, merely correcting those mistakes which could be corrected on the authority of the MSS.

The same discrepancy between the text of the Brāhmaṇa and Śāyana's quotation may be observed II. 9, 1. Here the passage referred to occurs in the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa VI. 3, 3, 7: नि होता होतृपदने विदान इति । अग्नैर्वै होता कृष्णाजिनं होतृपदने विदान इति विद्वानित्येतत् त्वेषो दीदिवान् ॥२॥ असदत्सुदक्ष इति त्वेषो दीप्यमानोऽसदत्सुदक्ष इत्येतदद्वयप्रमतिवैशिष्ट्य इत्यद्वयप्रमतिर्लक्ष्यं वसिष्ठः सहस्रंभरः शुचिजिह्वो अग्निरिति सर्वं वै सहस्रं सर्वंभरः शुचिजिह्वो अग्निरित्येतद्वाभ्यामाग्नेयीभ्यां त्रिष्टुब्भ्यां तस्योक्तो बंधुः ॥

P. 457. l. 17. From II. 11, 2. to II. 15, 1. A. is wanting.

P. 457. l. 22. (II. 11, 2.) लङि सिचि रूपं ॥ लङि सिचि रूपं B. लङि सि रूपं Ca. C.

P. 458. l. 16. (II. 11, 4.) इतीत्यंरूपेण B. इतीत्यंरूपेण Ca. C.

P. 458. l. 17. (II. 11, 4.) सुहु प्रेरकेण ॥ सुहु प्रकारेण Ca. C. B.

P. 461. l. 20. (II. 11, 11.) लिटि रूपं ॥ लङि रूपं Ca. C. B.

P. 462. l. 13. (II. 11, 13.) ये ते तवावस्यवो ॥ तेन अवस्यवो B. ते तव अवस्यवो C. ते तव अस्यवो Ca.

P. 463. l. 11. (II. 11, 15.) इत् एवार्थं ॥ इत् इवार्थं B. Ca. C.

P. 463. l. 14. (II. 11, 15.) पशुपुत्रादिभिरस्मान् अस्मत्पालनेन च ॥ पशुपुत्रादिभिरस्मादिभिरस्मान् पालनेन च Ca. पशुपुत्रादिभिरस्माभिरस्मात्पालनेन च B., and sec. manu रस्मदिभिरस्मात्पालनेन च.

P. 464. l. 25. (II. 11, 19.) Instead of सनेन one MS. reads सनेन. See the Commentary. ततः, however, is ādyudātta in all the MSS.

P. 465. l. 23. (II. 11, 20.) अर्बुदवधः स्पष्टमुक्तः ॥ अर्बुदवयः स्पष्टमुक्तं B. Ca. C. See Rv. I. 51, 6.

P. 468. l. 5. (II. 12, 1.) अस्मिन्पक्षे भवतेत्युच्यते ॥ अस्मिन्पक्षे प्रत्यये व्याख्येयं Ca. अस्मिन्पक्षे प्रवृत्तं व्याख्येयं B.

P. 470. l. 5. (II. 12, 5.) The whole passage from तथा च मंत्वे to स इन्द्रोऽस्तीति is left out in Ca. The original reading in Ca. seems to have been तथा च मंत्वे नैन्द्रो अस्तीति, but this is corrected into तथा च मंत्वे नैन्द्रो अस्तीति, which became the reading of the C. MSS. In B., where this passage is preserved, mistakes occur towards the end; the MS. has ह्रस्वः । त् तस्मात् अस्मा इन्द्राय स इन्द्रो, and अ is added in the margin.

P. 473. l. 10. (II. 12, 12.) ये च मेऽग्निमिविद्विषः ॥ ये च मेश इति द्विषः Ca. C. ये चेर्मेऽग्निमिविद्विषः B. Cf. Taitt. Ār. I. 9. अग्निमिविद्विषः is explained by Śāyana शिमिः कर्म कृष्णादिकं । तस्य विधातकाः शिमिविद्विषः । तद्विपरीता अग्निमिविद्विषः । कृष्णाद्यनुकूलप्रवृत्तयो वायव इत्यर्थः.

P. 481. l. 20. (II. 13, 13.) अंतर्णीतस्यैवात् C. B. अंतर्भावितस्यैवात् B. sec. manu in marg. Ibidem स त्वन्यः (?) सत्त्वं Ca. C. सत्त्वं B.

P. 483. l. 19. (II. 14, 4.) जने लोपः Ca.; जवे लोपः B.; but neither of the two readings seems right. It might be जनेति लोपः or गवेति लोपः, but even then the elision of the न would not be accounted for.

P. 486. l. 17. (II. 14, 10.) चतुर् लोपोऽभ्यासस्येत्यभ्यासलोपः । सः स्याद्विधातुक इति ॥ अत लोपोऽभ्यास-  
स्याद्विधातुक इति Ca. B. Cf. Pāṇ. VII. 4, 58, and 49.

P. 487. l. 1. (II. 14, 11.) ऊर्द्वं न । ऊर्द्वं दीर्घमूर्द्वं कुसूलं Ca. In the margin Ca. adds मूर्जे  
न दीर्घे, which the C. MSS. adopt, reading ऊर्द्वं दीर्घमूर्जे न दीर्घमूर्द्वं. B. has ऊर्द्वं न । उदीर्घ-  
मूर्द्वं कुसूलं. The addition in Ca. is taken from the Nirukta, III. 20: ऊर्द्वं कृदरमित्यावप-  
नस्योर्द्वमूर्द्वं भवत्यूर्जे दीर्घे वा । तमूर्द्वं न पृथक्ता यवेनेत्यपि निगमो भवति । तमूर्द्वमिव पूरयत यवेन. Roth  
has पूरयति, but the Nirukta and its Commentary have पूरयत, MS. 1738. and 357.  
The same MS. 1738. reads also उदीर्घे like Sāyana, but the Commentator says, ऊर्द्वं  
हि तदीर्घं भवति.

P. 494. l. 20. From II. 16, 6. to II. 23, 11. A. is wanting.

P. 497. l. 19. (II. 17, 3.) प्रथमं मुख्यं ॥ प्रथममुक्त्यं Ca. C. B.

P. 505. l. 24. (II. 19, 2.) इति खराणि खसराणि ॥ इति ख इति खसराणि Ca. and B.; but ख इति  
is cancelled in B.

P. 508. l. 13. (II. 19, 7.) मितां ह्रस्व इति ह्रस्वः. Instead of this Ca. reads हिंसकस्यासुरस्य खमिति  
खरः. B. has only हिंसखरः. The words हिंसकस्यासुरस्य are evidently repeated from the pre-  
ceding line, being an explanation of पीयोः. Therefore we have खमिति खरः together  
with हिंसखरः, which leads naturally to a conjecture like मितां ह्रस्व इति ह्रस्वः, though it  
cannot be denied that something else also may have stood here in Sāyana's  
original. Rv. I. 174, 8, where the same words occur, नननो वधरदेवस्य पीयोः, no  
explanation is given.

P. 509. l. 19. (II. 20, 1.) मनीषा मनस इषया B. मनस ईषया Ca. The MSS. are always  
at variance in the explanation of this word. The Nirukta explains मनीषा by मनस  
इषा, but it is hardly credible that Yāska should mean इषा in the sense of 'pole or  
shaft of a plough.' From the manner in which Sāyana explains मनीषा, it would  
seem as if he took इषा either as इषा, in the sense of इच्छा, 'wish, desire;' or as ईशा,  
in the sense of 'power.' Both forms, इषा and ईशा, would be ungrammatical; but  
in grammatical explanations Indian grammarians are not always grammatical.  
In some cases the Commentator has evidently derived मनीषा from मनः and ईश्; for  
instance, I. 186, 1, मनस ईशितृत्वेन, though here also इशितृत्वेन would not be too much for  
Sāyana, and in the majority of cases इष् is indeed best supported by the MSS.

P. 510. l. 18. (II. 20, 3.) फलस्य शमयिता B. Ca. C. यवयिता?

P. 520. l. 21. (II. 23, 2.) C. adds वसत्येषु परं तेन इति उसाः, a gloss which occurs neither  
in Ca. nor in B., and must therefore be ascribed to the later copyists of the C. MSS.

P. 521. l. 7. (II. 23, 3.) खगीस्य लंभकं; the MSS. have सर्वस्य लंभकं. See, however,  
Rv. Bh. I. 96, 4.

P. 522. l. 4. (II. 23, 5.) The वा after ध्वरः seems to indicate the omission of  
another word. As ध्वरः occurs but once more in the Rig-veda, IV. 23, 7, where  
ध्वरसं is simply explained by हिंसिको, it is difficult to supply the omission.

P. 526. l. 25. (II. 23, 15.) कतुमद् ज्ञानोपेतं A. C. कर्मसाधनं च विभाति B.

P. 528. l. 3. (II. 23, 17.) After हे ब्रह्मणस्पते all the MSS. (A. B. C.) have ब्रह्मणस्पतिं महो महत् चतस्र्य यज्ञस्य धर्तारि धारके यजमाने, and they omit त्वां to explain त्वा, which I have added after उक्तं. Instead of सरेण A. and Ca. have साधारणं, and भवति instead of भवेति.

P. 536. l. 20. (II. 24, 13.) अतस्ते तमस्मदीयं यज्ञं ॥ अतस्ते तमस्मदीयं यज्ञः A. B. C.

P. 536. l. 26. (II. 24, 13.) वशाया गोः ॥ वशायागे A. B. C.

P. 537. l. 24. From II. 24, 15. to II. 31, 1. A. is wanting.

P. 545. l. 25. (II. 27, 4.) एवंगुणविशिष्टानुग्रहा वा ॥ एवंगुणविशिष्टा ग्रहा वा B. एवंगुणविशिष्टा ग्रहानु वा C. Ca. The वा, which stands in all the MSS., shows that something is omitted.

P. 548. l. 9. (II. 27, 9.) चृजीकाय स्तोत्राणां Ca. B.; might it be चृजीकाय स्तोत्रे वा?

P. 554. l. 6. (II. 28, 3.) पूर्वमन्त्रितांगवद्भवेन ॥ पूर्वमन्तांगवद्भवेन B. पूर्वमन्तांगवद्भवेन Ca.

P. 557. l. 25. (II. 28, 11.) अवयुय स्थितो is neither in B. nor in Ca.; it was supplied from II. 27, 17.

P. 574. l. 7. (II. 32, 8.) Instead of एवमुच्चरन्नापि योज्यं (A. Ca.) B. has या सिनीवाली या राका या सरस्वती ता रता अह्ने. The last sentence इंद्रवरुणेत्यादि belongs only to A. and C.

P. 574. l. 12. (II. 33, 1.) B. leaves out considerable portions of the Commentary. After प्रथमं सूक्तं B. reads गृत्सुद चृषिः त्रिष्टुप् छंदः रुद्रो देवता । आ ते पंचोना रौद्रमित्यनुक्रमणिका । तत्र प्रथमा । हे मरुतां पितः रुद्र ते त्वदीयमस्मभ्यं दातव्यं सुप्तमेतु । आगच्छतु । तथा त्वं नोऽस्मान् सूर्यस्य संदशः संदशी-नान्मा युयोधाः । मा पृथक्कार्षीः । Then in marg. “यु मिश्रणामिश्रयोः । लङि छांदसः शपः श्रुः । छंदस्युभ-यचेत्याद्विधातुकत्वेन डित्वाभावाद्गुणः । अर्वन्ति शत्रुभेतातृभ्यो वा अर्वन्ति श्रुतेः । नोऽस्माकं वीरो” वीर्यान्पुत्रादिरभिधमेत । अभिभवतु । हे रुद्र etc. Instead of शत्रौ A. reads शत्रुभेतातृ; Ca. has शत्रो, altered into शत्रुभेतातृ. Instead of पुत्रादिः Ca. and A. have पुत्रो हि.

P. 575. l. 13. (II. 33, 2.) B. leaves out again several portions of the Commentary, principally the grammatical explanations.

P. 581. l. 8. (II. 33, 14.) अप परि वज्जने Ca. A. अपपरी वज्जने C. deest in B.

P. 582. l. 7. (II. 34, 1.) After चालयिताः the C. MSS., but not Ca., have यद्वा सर्वस्य जगतो धारयिताः ॥

P. 582. l. 15. (II. 34, 1.) भूम्याख्यो ॥ भूमिणाख्या A. C. deest in B.

P. 583. l. 19. (II. 34, 3.) कर्णैः कृतैर्मध्यप्रदेशैः ॥ कर्णैः कृतैर्मध्यप्रदेशैः A. Ca. कर्णैः कृतैः मध्यप्रदेशैः B. कर्णैः कृतैर्मध्यप्रदेशैः C.

P. 583. l. 21. (II. 34, 3.) समानवयस्काः A. B. C. It ought to be समानमनस्काः.

P. 584. l. 7. (II. 34, 4.) अनवभराथसः etc. B., which still contains an abbreviated text, reads अनवभं भंजनरहितं राधो धनं येषां ते बहुव्रीहौ नञ्सुभ्यामित्युच्चरपदांतोदात्तत्वं. The words from नञ् to the end are marked with two dots over the line, which indicates that they were to be omitted. But as they are evidently taken from the text which we find in A. and C., we may conclude that the shorter text of B. for the last two leaves is the result of an intentional abbreviation.

P. 588. l. 20. (II. 34, 13.) शब्दकारिभिर्वीणाख्यैर्वीणाविशेषैः A. B. C. शब्दकारिभिः श्रोत्राख्यैर्वीणाविशेषैः?

P. 588. l. 26. (II. 34, 13.) मेधादुदकं चिंतयंतः A. B. C. मेधादुदकं चिखंतः or सिंचंतः ?

P. 592. l. 25. (II. 35, 5.) B., which is complete again, adds हि पूरुः at the end of

verse 5. The same addition occurs at the end of verse 8, where B. alone reads  
चः पूर्यः.

P. 597. l. 23. (II. 36, 1.) उपरिष्ठादेव ताः ॥ उपरिष्ठादेवताः A. B. C.

P. 605. l. 19. (II. 38, 4.) The MSS. of the text have अर्धः or अर्द्धः; Sáyana अर्द्धः.

P. 607. l. 7. (II. 38, 7.) After अरख्येषु the MSS. have यथा. Instead of देवस्य सवितु  
A. and Ca. C. have ईशः.

P. 623. l. 12. (II. 43, 1.) Sáyana does not quote the last words of the Sarvánu-  
krama ताभ्यामृषिरश्वानि वाश्यमानं शकुंतं तुष्टाव. Shadguruśishya explains शकुंतं by कपिंजलाक्षं  
पक्षिरूपिणमिंद्रं. The Liṭ of तुष्टाव he explains by अस्तौदिति वाच्ये तुष्टावेत्युपदेशप्रत्यभिज्ञानार्थं । उन्नं  
हि बृहदेवतायां व्यक्तं । श्रुतं तु पुनरेवैच्छन्निद्रो भूत्वा कपिंजलः । चतुर्धेजिगमिषोराशां ववाशेक्ष्येण दक्षिणां । स तमार्धेण  
संग्रस्य चक्षुषा पक्षिरूपिणं । एताभ्यामभितुष्टाव सूक्ताभ्यां तु कनिक्कददिति ॥

At the end of the second Maṇḍala S 1. has the following Khila :

भद्रं वंद दक्षिणतो भद्रमुत्तरतो वंद । भद्रं पुरस्तान्नो वद भद्रं पश्चान्नपिंजल ॥

भद्रं वद पुनैर्भद्रं वद गृहेषु च । भद्रमस्माकं वद भद्रं नो अभयं वद ॥

भद्रमथस्तान्नो वद भद्रमुपरिष्ठान्नो वद । भद्रं भद्रं न आवद भद्रं नः सर्वतो वद ॥

असपत्नं पुरास्तान्नः शिवं दक्षिणतस्कृधि । अभयं सततं पश्चाद्भद्रमुत्तरतो गृहे ॥

यौवनानि महयसि जिग्युषामिव दुंदुभिः । शकुंतक प्रदक्षिणं शतपत्ताभि नो वद ॥

आवर्त्तस्वं शकुने भद्रमावर्त्तन्तूष्णीमासीनः सुमतिं चिकिद्भि नः । यदुत्पत्तवर्त्तसि<sup>h</sup> कर्करीयेषा बृहद्वेदेन विदधे सुवीराः ॥

S 2. and MS. Bodl. Wilson 429. have not got it, but S 2. adds after Varga 12, पदशिष्टं,  
a word occurring so frequently in the MSS. instead of परिशिष्टं, that I am almost  
inclined to take it as a synonyme of Parisishta. It might mean what is left  
out in the Pada. S 3. and MS. Bodl. Wilson 435. give the first five verses, both  
without accents except in the first verse. Neither the Sāma, Yajur, or Atharva-  
veda contain this Khila. The first verse is quoted in the Nirukta, IX. 5; cf. Roth,  
Abhandlungen, p. 32, and Notes on Nir. IX. 5.

### Maṇḍala III.

Sáyana passes over what Kátyáyana says about the race of Viśvámitra: कुशिक-  
कल्वैषीरधिर्निद्रुत्वं पुत्रमिच्छन्नद्रचर्यं चचार । तस्मिंद एव गाथी पुत्रो जज्ञे गाथिनो विश्वामित्रः स तृतीयं मंडलम-  
पश्यत्. According to Shadguruśishya this preamble was meant to vindicate the  
Riśhitva of the family of Viśvámitra: सत्यपवादे स्वयमृषित्वमनुभवतो विश्वामित्रगोत्रस्य विवक्ष्ये-  
तिहासमाह. This was probably the reason why Sáyana left it out.

P. 632. l. 4. (III. 1, 16.) वरिवयुक्त्यायेन ? A. C. नतिवयुक्त्यायेन B.

P. 636. l. 4. (III. 2, 2.) प्रभाधनः C. प्रधानः A. Ca. प्रभाधानः B., but altered into प्रधानः.

P. 640. l. 3. (III. 2, 12.) खरोहिद्रिः ॥ खदेशोभिः A. C. खरितो निनः B.

<sup>g</sup> कपिंजल S 3.

<sup>h</sup> On Karkari and Karkaripa, see Prof. Stenzler, Indische Studien II. 159.

P. 642. l. 9. (III. 3, 2.) Instead of धियावसुः प्रज्ञया व्यातः, which is in B., A. and C. read विभावसुः प्रभया व्यातः. A. in the text of the hymn has धियावसुः.

P. 646. l. 3. (III. 4, 1.) त्वष्टुर्वाज्या तन्न इत्येषा ॥ त्वष्टुर्वाज्ये वमित्येषा A. C. त्वष्टुर्वाज्ये वमित्येषा B.,  
 पु struck out manu. sec.

P. 646. l. 23. (III. 4, 2.) शरीराणां न पातयितः ॥ शरीराणां न पातः B. शरीराणां पातः A. C.

P. 648. l. 4. (III. 4, 5.) प्रविचरंत । प्रविचरंतु C. विचरंत प्रविचरंतु A. Ca. अभिविचरंत । प्रविचरंतु B.

P. 649. l. 7. (III. 4, 8.) मनुष्यैश्च संगता त्व - इला A. Ca. मनुष्यैश्च संगत C. मनुष्यैश्च संगता इला B.

P. 649. l. 9. (III. 4, 8.) अर्वागाभिमुख्यमेतद्वहिः सदंतु । आसीदंतु ॥ अर्वागाभिमुख्यं एतद्वहिः सदंतु ।  
 आसीदंतु A. आयागतिमुख्यं एतद्वहिः सदंतु । आसीदंतु Ca., but with a marginal correction in  
 black ink, अर्वागाभि. आयागतिमुख्यं एतद्वहिः सदंतु आसीदंतु C. आयाति अर्वाक् आभिमुख्यं देवीरिदं  
 एतद्वहिः सदंतु आसीदंतु B.

P. 650. l. 17. (III. 5, 1.) सूक्तत्रयस्य ॥ सूक्तयस्य A. C. B.

P. 658. l. 11. (III. 6, 9.) बलार्थं अन्नार्थं वा A. Ca. manu sec.; deest in C. B. reads सोम-  
 मुद्दिश्य instead.

### Ashtaka III.

From the beginning of the third Ashtaka to the end of the eighth a new MS. comes in, E. I. H. 1861—1864. It was bequeathed in 1822 by Dr. Taylor to the Honourable Court of Directors; and as it was procured at Bombay we might expect that it belonged to the B. class. It is indeed but a repetition of the same MS. which we have in B 1. 2. 3., and therefore of no importance for the restitution of the text. The mutual relation of the different MSS. may be seen from the beginning of the third Ashtaka.

B 1. has श्रीगणेशाय नमः ॥ श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ वागीशाद्याः सुमनस इत्यादि ॥

B 3. has श्रीगणेशाय नमः श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ वागीशाद्याः सुमनस इत्यादि ॥

B 4. has श्रीगणेशाय नमः श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः वागीशाद्याः सुमनस इत्यादि ॥

A 2. has श्रीगणेशाय नमः ॥ श्रीसरस्वत्यै नमः ॥ श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ ॥ वागीशाद्या इत्यादि ॥

Ca. has श्रीगणेशाय नमः ॥ ॐ वागीशाद्याः सुमनस इत्यादि ॥

C 2. has श्रीगणेशाय नमः ॥ ॐ वागीशाद्याः सुमनस इत्यादि ॥

C 4. has श्रीगणेशाय नमः ॐ वागीशाद्याः सुमनस इत्यादि ॥

C 5. has श्रीगणेशाय नमः वागीशाद्याः सुमनस इत्यादि ॥

P. 664. l. 9. (III. 7, 3.) नील not to be found in the Gana वृषादि.

P. 664. l. 11. (III. 7, 3.) The Upādi-sūtra is given differently by the different MSS.

A. has अत्यविचमितमिरभिपनिपतिभ्यः ; C. अत्यविचमितमिरभिलभिपनिपतिभ्यः ; B. अत्यविचमितमिरमिपतिभ्यः.

P. 664. l. 20. (III. 7, 4.) ऊर्जयंतीरवलं बलिन कुर्वन्तः B. ०वलं बलिं कुर्वन्तः A. अग्निं बलिनं कुर्वन्तः C.

P. 664. l. 21. (III. 7, 4.) स्तभूपमानं । सभू स्तभनं तमिच्छंतं A. स्तभु स्तभनं तमिच्छंतं C. स्तभू स्तभनं तमिच्छंतं B.

P. 666. l. 21. (III. 7, 6.) व्याज्यतिभ्यः कुरिति क्तुः. In A. the words from व्याज्येनानं° to  
 ०तिभ्यः have been omitted. व्याज्यतिभ्यः कुरिति क्तुः Ca. व्याजतिभ्यः कुरिति क्तुः B. No rule is  
 found in the Upādi-sūtras by which अक्तुः is explained. क्तुः is explained there

by itself, without सक्तुः; Un. S. I. 71. In the next passage where सक्तुः is discussed by Sáyana, he considers it as a báhulaka formation; III. 17, 1. अज्यत एभिरिति बाहुल-  
कत्वात् क्तुः कण्ठे । कित्वादुपधालोपः । प्रत्ययस्वरः ॥

P. 667. l. 7. (III. 7, 7.) Between देवानां and व्रता C. adds संबंधीनि.

P. 667. l. 8. (III. 7, 7.) अग्नेः प्रसादाद्देवा यज्ञान् लभ्यन्त A. C. अग्नेः प्रसादाद्देविल्लेखयान्नवंतो देवा  
यज्ञान् लभ्यन्त B.

P. 667. l. 10. (III. 7, 7.) गतेः प्रकृतिस्वरत्वं A. B. गतेः पूर्वपदप्रकृतिस्वरत्वं C.

P. 667. l. 17. (III. 7, 8.) Repeated from III. 4, 7.

P. 669. l. 21. (III. 7, 10.) उप दाहे B. उप सुप दाहे A. C.

P. 670. l. 8. (III. 7, 11.) गवादिपशून् संपादयित्वा A. B. गवादिपशूनां प्रदातृ C.

P. 670. l. 22. (III. 8, 1.) वैश्वदेवी यौपी वा C. यूपी वा A. B.

P. 670. l. 21. (III. 8, 1.) Ca. has a marginal note on leaf 8<sup>b</sup>. The words are एरने-  
काच इति यज्ञ । उदात्तस्वरितयोरिति स्वरितत्वं । अनुहुप् । ईषहुःसुप् स्य इति विधीयमान. They are pre-  
ceded by a २, and in the second line there is a mark between कृत्स्नस्य and यूपो. It  
is clear that these words did not come from the Kalam of Sáyana; and as  
neither A. nor B. has them, they were most probably an incidental remark  
made by a Brahman as he was reading or explaining the Veda. All the later  
C. MSS. have inserted this line between कृत्स्नस्य and यूपो.

P. 670. l. 26. (III. 8, 1.) यूपपरिव्ययणे C. यूपपरिव्ययमाणे A. B. Some words seem to have  
been omitted; we expect यूपपरिव्ययणे युवा सुवासा इत्येषा । यूपे परिव्ययमाणे युवा सुवासाः परिवीत  
आगादिति परिदधादिति सूत्रितत्वात्.

P. 671. l. 1. (III. 8, 1.) यूपैकादश्याम C. यथैकादश्याम B. सत्वैकादश्याम A.

P. 671. l. 11. (III. 8, 1.) देवसंबन्धिना मधुना deest in A. B.

P. 671. l. 24. (III. 8, 1.) प्रत्ययस्वरेण मध्योदात्तः B. प्रत्ययस्वरेणाहुदात्तः A. C.

P. 672. l. 12. (III. 8, 1.) भ्राभ्यस्तयोरान् इत्याकारलोपः । दधस्तयोश्चेति भयभावः A. B. In Ca. all  
except the last word भावः was omitted, but supplied by a marginal note. The  
other C. MSS. have inserted the words in their proper place.

P. 672. l. 13. (III. 8, 1.) क्षियन्ति निवसंतस्मिन्नित्यधिकरणे घः ॥ क्षियन्ति निवसन्ति अधिकरणे ऋः A. and  
B., except that B. has something like पृः instead of ऋः. Ca. had the same read-  
ing as A., but it was corrected by marginal notes into the reading which has  
been adopted in the text.

P. 672. l. 14. (III. 8, 1.) The words from निवास to रुकारः are omitted in A.; those  
from उपस्थे to पूर्वपदांतोदात्तत्वं are omitted in A. and Ca., but Ca. has added them  
in the margin.

P. 676. l. 14. (III. 8, 6.) निमिम्युः । अवटेपु प्रचिक्षिपुः ॥ निमिम्युः प्रचिक्षिपुः A. Ca. had the  
same, but it was corrected into निमिम्युः अवटेपु प्रचिक्षिपुः. B. has निमिम्युः अनंदेपु प्रचिक्षिपुः,  
and sec. manu अनंदेपु.

P. 676. l. 21. (III. 8, 6.) खपितिः खङ्गः ॥ खपिति ह्रस्वः A. C. खपितिः ह्रस्वः B. Perhaps the  
original MS. had खपितिः ङ्गस्वः, which might have given rise to the reading of ह्रस्वः.

P. 677. l. 12. (III. 8, 7.) इति खेतं यज्ञः ॥ इति खेतं MSS.

P. 677. l. 17. (III. 8, 7.) चंतु. The MSS. agree in deriving चंतु from इण् गतौ; but the इकारलोपः, which they likewise agree in (except that A. has नृ इकारलोपः), shows that it was derived from वी, which in the Dhātupāṭha is 24, 39, while इण् is 24, 36. From वी we should get वियंतु, and by इकारलोपः, चंतु. Sāyaṇa may possibly have given two derivations; one from इण् गतौ, which would give अयंतु, and with व्यकारोपजन, चंतु; and a second from वी गति°, making वियंतु, and by इकारलोपः, चंतु.

P. 678. l. 22. (III. 8, 9.) दीप्मानि वासांसि A. C. दीप्मानि रज्जनाख्यानि वासांसि B.

P. 679. l. 12. (III. 8, 10.) प्रतिमुक्तकंटाः ॥ प्रतिमुक्तकटाः B. अमुक्तकंटाः A. प्रमुक्तकंटाः Ca., and ति in marg.

P. 680. l. 1. (III. 8, 11.) सहस्रवल्ग्याः सहस्रशाखाः संतो A. B. C., but Ca. adds in marg. पुत्रपौ-  
त्रादिसंतानपरंपरया सहस्रशा°.

P. 680. l. 8. (III. 8, 11.) पादादिह्वादिनिघातः A. B. C., but Ca. sec. manu यद्वृत्तयोगादिनिघातः.

P. 680. l. 21. (III. 9, 1.) सुदीर्घिति ॥ सुदीर्घिति A. B. C., but B. sec. manu सुदीर्घि.

P. 681. l. 9. (III. 9, 2.) वना काननानि. Ca. adds in the margin रक्षितुं.

P. 681. l. 10. (III. 9, 2.) मातृरूपो Ca. marg.; deest in A. B.

P. 682. l. 1. (III. 9, 3.) तदुचितफलप्रदानेन B. ते दुचित् । फलप्रदानेन A. C. Ca. sec. manu दुर्चित् ।  
फलप्रदानेन.

P. 682. l. 3. (III. 9, 3.) सख्ये मैत्रे A. C. सख्ये मित्रत्वे B.

P. 684. l. 4. (III. 9, 6.) विश्वान् । विश्व प्रवेशन etc. The text has been restored according to the Unādi-sūtras. B., though hardly legible, seems to agree with it, adding only रणि (to form रण). In A. the whole explanation is missing; C. has a number of corrections sec. manu, most of which are unintelligible.

P. 684. l. 6. (III. 9, 6.) क्त्वा । टा । जसादयश्छं ॥ शसाद° A. B. C. Cf. Rv. I. 39, 1.

P. 684. l. 9. (III. 9, 6.) वखादित्वात् ॥ वाखादित्वात् A. C., but Ca. sec. manu वापादित्वात्. B. reads शाखादित्वात्, evidently a later correction.

P. 684. l. 18. (III. 9, 7.) छंदयति छंदयति C. छंदयति छंदयति A. B. Naigh. III. 14. has छंदति  
छंदयते, with the various reading छंदयति.

P. 684. l. 20. (III. 9, 7.) यस्मात् ॥ यस्मात् A. B. C. After काल एव B. adds यत् यं.

P. 684. l. 21. (III. 9, 7.) दीप्मानं त्वां पशवो A. C. दीप्मानं अभिमतफलपशवो B.

P. 684. l. 22. (III. 9, 7.) पश्चादिलक्षणं फलं B. A. C. omit फलं.

P. 684. l. 23. (III. 9, 7.) इत्येतस्माद्भातोरुपरि रक्° A. C. °भातो रक् B.

P. 684. l. 25. (III. 9, 7.) छद् अपाकरणे A. अपावरणे Ca. sec. m. अपवारणे B.

P. 685. l. 21. (III. 9, 8.) ईडं स्तुतौ । अस्माख्यत्; the two last words have been inserted from the margin of Ca.; they are wanting in A. B.

P. 686. l. 3. (III. 9, 9.) त्रीणि शता त्रीणि शतानि Ca., trīṇi śatā being inserted in the margin. B. A. have only त्रीणि शतानि. In the next following words त्री सहस्राणि is omitted by B., but given by A. C.

P. 686. l. 10. (III. 9, 9.) त्रयस्त्रिंशविति A. त्रयस्त्रिंशविति Ca., and sec. m. शदिति. त्रिंशश्चेति B.



P. 686. l. 13. (III. 9, 9.) त्रयानां दशतां, as before दशानां दशतां. त्रयाणां दशतानां A. C. त्रयाणां दशानां B.

P. 686. l. 15. (III. 9, 9.) शु सुतावित्यस्माद्धातोर्गुदंशोर्नुदश्च । उ° १. १५६. ॥ शु सुतावित्यस्माद्धातोर्गुदंशोर्नुदश्चेति A. C. °धातोर्नुदश्चेति B.

P. 686. l. 20. (III. 9, 9.) वाक्येत्यनुवृत्तौ चादित्वान्विधाताभावः ॥ वाक्येत्यनुवृत्तौ इत्येदित्वान्विधाताभावः A. वाक्येत्यनुवृत्तौ इत्येदित्वान्विधाताभावः C. B., omitting this explanation, substitutes भिन्नवाक्य-त्वान्विधाताभावः, which the margin of Ca. has likewise, with the var. lect. अभिन्न°.

P. 689. l. 12. (III. 10, 5.) इति यप्रत्ययः ॥ इति प्रत्ययः A. B. C.

P. 689. l. 14. (III. 10, 5.) The words from विभक्ते to the end are omitted in A. The passage is given in B., and Ca. reads in marg. भृञ् भरणे । जुहोत्यादि भृजामित्यभ्यासस्य ईत्वे.

P. 689. l. 25. (III. 10, 6.) स्तुतिरूपास्मा वाच A. C. स्तुतिरूपा वाचो B.

P. 690. l. 2. (III. 10, 6.) अस्मात्पातृद्विविचिरीत्यादिना ॥ अस्मात्पातृद्विविचिरीत्यादिना A. Ca. pr. m. अस्मात्पातृद्विविचिरीत्यादिना Ca. sec. m. अस्मात्पातृद्विविचिरीत्यादिना B.

P. 690. l. 12. (III. 10, 7.) तदर्धं यद्व्याग्न्यादीन् A. B. C., but the margin of Ca. has यह-यान्देवानग्न्यादीन्.

P. 690. l. 26. (III. 10, 8.) शोभनसामर्थ्योपेतं दानभोगार्हं धनमस्मे अस्मभ्यं दीदिहि । यद्वा ह्युमन्नेजोयुक्तं सुवीर्यं. This passage has been supplied from the margin of Ca.; it was probably left out owing to the repetition of the word सुवीर्यं.

P. 691. l. 3. (III. 10, 8.) समीपवर्ती भव Ca. sec. m. समीपवर्तसि A. C. समीपे वर्तसि B.

P. 691. l. 8. (III. 10, 8.) °त्वादगुणः A. B. C. °त्वाद् गुणाभावः Ca. sec. m.

P. 691. l. 21. (III. 10, 9.) मथनरूपेण A. B. महेधनरूपेण Ca. sec. m.

P. 691. l. 22. (III. 10, 9.) सोमाद्याहुतिभिः A. B. C. सोमाज्याद्याहुतिभिः Ca. in marg.

P. 692. l. 1. (III. 10, 9.) खिः । उपधावृद्धिः. The last word supplied from the margin of Ca.

P. 693. l. 20. (III. 11, 3.) अस्यैतादृशस्याग्नैरर्थं गमनस्वभावं तेजोऽस्याकाशे दृश्यमानस्य तमसस्तरणि हि । तारकं खलु । निवर्तकमिति यावत् B. अस्य एतादृशस्याग्नैरर्थं गमनस्वभावं तेजः अस्य आकाशदृश्यमानस्य तमसः । तरणि हि रेकेन खलु निवर्तकमिति यावत् A. अस्य एतादृशस्याग्नैरर्थं गमनस्वभावं तेजः (तरणि हि माकारौ तरण-स्वभावं सर्वत्र प्रसङ्गस्वभावमित्यर्थः । यद्वा गमनस्वभावं तेजः marg.) अस्य काशे दृश्यमानस्य तमसस्तरणि तावद् खलु निवर्तकमिति यावत् Ca.

P. 694. l. 16. (III. 11, 5.) तत्तत्कर्मेणि A. B. C. तत्तत्कर्मेणि margin of Ca.

P. 694. l. 18. (III. 11, 5.) न दाभ्यः A. B. C. Ca. sec. m. अदाभ्यः. The original reading was probably अदाभ्यो न दाभ्यः.

P. 695. l. 7. (III. 11, 6.) ऽमृक्तः ॥ अत एव अमृक्तः Ca. marg.

P. 695. l. 14. (III. 11, 6.) तु वृत्ति etc.; inserted from the margin of Ca.; the whole passage being omitted in A. B. has तुः सौतो धातुः क्रिप्रत्ययः as a marginal note.

P. 695. l. 15. (III. 11, 6.) श्रूयतेऽन्नमिति Ca. sec. m. श्रूयते कमिति A. श्रूयते कर्मणीति B.

P. 696. l. 25. (III. 11, 9.) वाजेषु युजेषु A. B. C. Margin of Ca. वाजेषु यजेषु.

P. 697. l. 14. (III. 12, 1.) The words between सूति° and °यस्तृचः are omitted in A. The Viniyoga of verse 4, तोशा वृत्तहण, is omitted in A., B., and C., but supplied by Ca. in the margin.

P. 698. l. 4. (III. 12, 1.) यद्वा to पिबतं. The whole passage missing in B.

P. 698. l. 23. (III. 12, 1.) अनादेशप्राप्तौ A. B. C. अनादेशे प्राप्ते Ca. sec. m.

P. 699. l. 5. (III. 12, 3.) उचितफलप्रदानेनोपछन्दकाविं° Ca. sec. m. °प्रदानेन पापछेदकौ B. °प्रदाने पापछेदकौ A. C.

P. 699. l. 12. (III. 12, 3.) इति ऐत्वं ॥ इती टे एत्वं B. इतीर एत्वं A. इतीर एत्वं Ca. sec. m. C. inserts afterwards in the margin पररूपत्वं.

P. 699. l. 22. (III. 12, 4.) The words from परस्यापेक्षया to दातारौ are supplied from the margin of Ca. B. has the same, but omits परस्यापेक्षया जयशीलौ. The same explanation occurs in Sáyana's Commentary on the Sāma-veda.

P. 699. l. 26. (III. 12, 4.) लुकि सति द्वः संप्रसारणमित्यनुवृत्तौ बहुलं छंदसीति संप्रसारणं । उचङ्गदेशः A. The words after इत्यनुवृत्तौ are omitted in Ca., but added in the margin. In B. the words इत्यनुवृत्तौ बहुलं छंदसी are struck out.

P. 699. l. 27. (III. 12, 4.) शीङ्कुशिरुहिजिस्त्रिभूष्य. This is the reading on which the Unádi-sūtras and Ujjvaladatta's Unādivṛitti agree. उहशिरुहिजिस्त्रिभूष्य A. C. शीङ्कुशिरुहिजिस्त्रिभूष्यः Ca. sec. m. हशिरुहिजिस्त्रिभूष्ये B.

P. 700. l. 19. (III. 12, 5.) उक्थं येषां ते. ते added in the margin of Ca. उक्थयेषां A. B. C.

P. 701. l. 3. (III. 12, 6.) दासयंतुपक्षपयंतीति दासा उपक्षपयिताः Ca. sec. m. दासयंति उ दासा उपक्षपयिताः A. दासयंति इति । उ दासा उपक्षपयिताः C. दासयंति इति दासा उपक्षपयिताः B.

P. 701. l. 22. (III. 12, 7.) क्लिक्त्तौ च संज्ञायां added from the margin of Ca.

P. 702. l. 4. (III. 12, 8.) परस्परमवियुज्य ॥ परस्परं वियुज्य A. B. C.

P. 702. l. 5. (III. 12, 8.) सहैव वर्तमानत्वं B. स्वाहे च वर्तमानं A. C.

P. 702. l. 16. (III. 12, 9.) शतृन्परिभूषयः Ca. marg. शतृन्परिभूषयः A. B. C.

P. 702. l. 22. (III. 13, 1.) वैश्वामित्रचक्षुषभस्यार्षिमग्निदेवताकम् added from B.

P. 702. l. 24. (III. 13, 1.) The words from विश्वामित्रपुत्र to the beginning of the first verse are omitted in B.

P. 703. l. 9. (III. 13, 1.) वो युष्मत्संबंधिने A. C. नो अस्मत्सं° margin of Ca. नो युष्मत्सं° B.

P. 703. l. 10. (III. 13, 1.) वृद्धतमं प्रभूतमिदं स्तुतिरूपं स्तोत्रशस्त्रादि बोध्यजातं A. C. वृथतमं इदं प्रभूतं स्तोत्रं B.

P. 703. l. 11. (III. 13, 1.) प्रार्थे उच्चारय A. C. प्रार्थे उच्चारयत B., and Ca. sec. m.

P. 703. l. 25. (III. 13, 2.) अग्नेः प्रकाशकत्वेन A. C. अग्नेः प्रयोजकत्वेन B.

P. 704. l. 1. (III. 13, 2.) From हविषां प्रदातृत्वेन to हविर्वह° only in B., and in the margin of Ca.

P. 704. l. 15. (III. 13, 3.) कालोपराधेन A. C. कालोपराधेन B.

P. 704. l. 19. (III. 13, 3.) वः । युष्मत्संबंधिनं B. वः संबंधिनं A. C.

P. 704. l. 20. (III. 13, 3.) आहुतिप्रदानेन ॥ °प्रधानेन B. °सदानेन A. C.

P. 707. l. 2. (III. 13, 7.) अनेन शरीरस्य क्षीयदिद्वारा बलारोग्यप्रदं गवादिकं ॥ बलारो° पदं गत्वादिकं A. C. बलीरोपादयं गत्वादिकं B. बलारोग्यपदं गवादिकं Ca. sec. m.

P. 708. l. 7. (III. 14, 1.) तस्य पितृत्वादनुदात्तस्य धातुस्य B., and Ca. sec. m. तस्य पितृत्वादनुदात्तत्वे प्रत्ययस्यः A. C.

P. 708. l. 9. (III. 14, 1.) After छर्दि A. gives part of the explanation of the fourth and fifth verses, from शोचिषा दीप्या to मनसा जंतः. Ca. had the same, but the superfluous passages were remarked in time, and partly cancelled by the copyist.

P. 710. l. 1. (III. 14, 4.) अर्चन् वदन्ति A. C. - वदन्ति B., and Ca. sec. m.

P. 712. l. 1. (III. 14, 7.) अकर्म etc. The grammatical explanation omitted in B.

P. 714. l. 13. (III. 15, 3.) उरित्यनुवृत्तौ ॥ उदित्यनुवृत्तौ A. B. C.

P. 715. l. 8. (III. 15, 4.) हुत्वेन ङः inserted from C.

P. 716. l. 2. (III. 15, 5.) सन्निः संनिरुद्धः A. B. सन्निः संभक्ता सं[त]जनीयो वा यद्वा सन्निः संज्ञातः त्वं संनिरुद्धः C.

P. 716. l. 4. (III. 15, 5.) यथा रथो धान्यादिकं A. B. C. Between रथो and धान्यादिकं, Ca. marg. adds गंधादिकं. धान्यादिकं B. धान्यादिकं A. धनादिकं C.

P. 716. l. 8. (III. 15, 5.) सन्निः पस स्वप्ने B. पस स्वापै A. सन्निः पसनतेः स्नातेर्वा किन् लिङ्गज्ञात् द्विवचनं पस स्वापे Ca. In the third Ashtaka Ca. must generally be taken as the sole representative of the C. class, because the text of the other C. MSS. was mixed by the copyists, and sometimes taken from C., sometimes from A. The other C. MSS. are therefore of little value for determining the original text of Sáyana; and, except where the contrary is stated, C. is henceforth to be regarded as the mark of Ca.

P. 716. l. 20. (III. 15, 6.) तथा मर्तस्य शत्रोर्दुर्मति A. B. तथा मर्तस्य मनुष्यस्य अस्य दुर्मति C. अस्य being a correction (sec. m.) instead of शत्रोः as it seems.

P. 716. l. 22. (III. 15, 6.) पा पान इत्येतस्य A. B. पी प्यायतेर्गुङ्लुगस्य लोटि शपो लुगभावश्छांदसः पा पान etc. C.

P. 716. l. 24. (III. 15, 6.) आमंत्रितस्याविद्यमानवत्त्वेन etc. आमंत्रितस्याविद्यमान अतिङ् उच्चरं A. आमंत्रितस्याविद्यमानत्वेन [विद्यमानत्वेन inserted from the margin] अतिङ् उच्चरं C. आमंत्रितस्य विद्यमानत्वेन अतिङ् उच्चरत्वाभावेन B.

P. 717. l. 18. (III. 16, 1.) अयं यजनीयत्वेन A. C. अयं यजमानेन B. sec. m.

P. 717. l. 22. (III. 16, 1.) तत्त्वामित्वात् omitted in B.

P. 718. l. 14. (III. 16, 2.) पृतनासु सेनासु तदुपलक्षितेषु संग्रामेषु ॥ पृतनासु सेनासु तदक्षितेषु संग्रामेषु B. पृतनासु सेनासु तत् दुरिक्षेषु क्षितेषु संग्रामेषु A. पृतनासु [सेनासु क्षिपेषु marg.] सेनोपलक्षितेषु संग्रामेषु C.

P. 718. l. 15. (III. 16, 2.) The words between आत्मनो and आत्मनो inserted from Ca., C 2; wanting in A. B.

P. 719. l. 25. (III. 16, 4.) पुषोडाशादिहविर्भारसहनशीलः A. B. °हविर्भारस्य सहनशीलः C.

P. 720. l. 1. (III. 16, 4.) यद्वा विश्वानि to पूर्ववत् taken from Ca., where it stands immediately after आनपति, but not sec. m.

P. 720. l. 11. (III. 16, 4.) विश्वेत्यादिषु. The whole passage only in Ca.

P. 720. l. 17. (III. 16, 5.) दारिद्र्याय. Ca. inserts after it अदानाय.

P. 720. l. 18. (III. 16, 5.) तथावीरतायै to संपत्त्यभावस्य विषयभूतात्मा कुरु omitted in A. तथावीरतायै अपुत्रतायै मा कुरु तथा अस्मान् अगोतायै etc. B.

P. 720. l. 22. (III. 16, 5.) द्वेषांश्च ॥ द्वेषांश्च B. द्वेषा च A. द्वेषान् C.

P. 722. l. 13. (III. 17, 1.) After घृतनिर्णिक C. pr. m. has निर्णिकगिति रूपनाम । दीप्तरूपः. Cf. Maṇḍala II. 35, 4.

P. 722. l. 18. (III. 17, 1.) बाहुलकत्वात् कुः ॥ बाहुलवा कुः A. C. बाहुलवात् कुः C. sec. m. In B. the whole passage is wanting.

P. 723. l. 11. (III. 17, 2.) तन्प्रत्ययेनांतोदात्तः A. C. deest in B. तन्प्रत्ययांतो व्यत्ययेनांतोदात्तः may have been the original text.

P. 723. l. 26. (III. 17, 3.) प्रजामेका. The passage is partly corrected after the text of the Átharvāṇa VIII. 9, 13, where, instead of the first रक्षति, we read जिन्वति. प्रजामेका रक्षत्यूर्वजमेका रक्षन्तमेकारक्षतीति A. प्रजामेका रक्षत्यूर्वजमेका च तामकारक्षतीति C. sec. m.

P. 724. l. 21. (III. 17, 4.) वासौहारी C. वासौकारी A. अन्नकारी B.

P. 724. l. 26. (III. 17, 4.) पादादित्वाच्च निधातः ॥ पादादित्वाच्चिधातः A. B. C.

P. 727. l. 15. (III. 18, 2.) संप्रसारणवलीयस्वान्विबृत्तिः A. C. संप्रसारणवलीयस्वान्विधातः B.

P. 728. l. 2. (III. 18, 3.) वंदमानस्त्वां सुवन्नहं C. वंदमानस्त्वं वंदमामहं A. वंदमानोऽहं B. sec. m.

P. 728. l. 3. (III. 18, 3.) तावहेहि A. C. तावदेहि B.

P. 728. l. 5. (III. 18, 3.) इध्मः B. इध्मं A. C.

P. 728. l. 21. (III. 18, 4.) विश्वामित्तोत्पन्नेषु only from C. but pr. m.

P. 728. l. 22. (III. 18, 4.) एकस्मिन्बहुवचनं C. एक एकस्मिन्बहुवचनं A. एकः एकस्मिन्बहुवचनं B.

P. 728. l. 24. (III. 18, 4.) शं रोगाणां श्मनमस्मासु C. शं रोगाणां यं श्मनं चास्मासु A. शं रोगाणामु-  
पश्मनं चास्मासु B.

P. 728. l. 25. (III. 18, 4.) योर्भयानां यावनं मिश्रणं C. योर्भयानां अमिश्रणं A. योः भयानां अमिश्रणं B.

P. 729. l. 8. (III. 18, 4.) अदिशदिः; C. inserts before it - - इद्वज्जोगोविचि.

P. 729. l. 9. (III. 18, 4.) दुकृन् करणे A. B. कृत्करणं C.

P. 729. l. 18. (III. 18, 5.) उत्तमं धनं A. C. धनं wanting in B.

P. 729. l. 20. (III. 18, 5.) खलु भवसि. भवसि added from the margin of C.

P. 731. l. 6. (III. 19, 2.) प्राप्तेर्धनैः सह सन् C. sec. m. प्राप्तेर्धनैः सह A. सह सन् omitted in B.

P. 731. l. 17. (III. 19, 2.) संग्रामयतेरेव C. सम्प्रामयतेरेव A. सम्मानयतेरेव B.

P. 732. l. 1. (III. 19, 3.) त्वोतः यस्त्वया रक्षमायः C. त्वोतः स त्वया रक्षमायः A. त्वोतः तया रक्षा-  
मायः B.

P. 732. l. 4. (III. 19, 3.) अभिमतफलप्रदाने शकितुमिच्छोः A. C. अभिमतत्वात् फलप्रदानशकितुमिच्छोः B.

P. 732. l. 5. (III. 19, 3.) प्रभावे महिम्नि A. B. C. adds ऐश्वर्यं.

P. 732. l. 9. (III. 19, 3.) इत्युबलोपः C. इत्युट लोपः A. इत्युल्लोपः B.

P. 733. l. 1. (III. 19, 4.) देवानिह ॥ देवमिह A. B. C.

P. 733. l. 16. (III. 19, 5.) पालयिता भवामीति A. C. पालयिता भवानिति B.

P. 733. l. 18. (III. 19, 5.) वृक्षेषु ॥ वृक्षेषु A. B. C.

P. 734. l. 13. (III. 20, 1.) सजोषसः परस्परं संगता भूत्वा A. B. सजोषसः सह प्रीयमाणाः संमिलिता भूत्वा C.

P. 735. l. 6. (III. 20, 2.) After जिह्वाः B. reads खहिकादिभेदेन त्रिप्रकारा जिह्वाः; C. also had  
सात्विकादिभेदेन त्रिप्रकाराः, but in brackets.

P. 735. l. 21. (III. 20, 3.) धर्मरहितस्य तव. C. inserts here अतः तैत्तिरीयेऽमृतस्य धर्मेति पाठात्सू-  
त्रकृता अग्ने भूरीत्याग्नेया धाम - - - छंदे निर्दिष्टत्वाद्दत्तुसारेण पूर्वं भाष्यकृतो व्याख्यातवन्तः. The whole

passage, however, is marked as a later addition (sec. m.), though it stands in the text.

P. 735. l. 23. (III. 20, 3.) अपेक्षितफलप्रश्नविषयाणां A. B. अपेक्षितफलप्रदं (किं फलं अपेक्षितं इति पृष्टा बंधवो येन तादृशं अनुग्रहं) विषयाणां C. It seems that many marginal notes existed in the original codex.

P. 735. l. 25. (III. 20, 3.) संदधुः संप्रयुजिरे A. संदधुः संयुजिरे C. संदधुः संदधिरे किंच संप्रयुजिरे B.

P. 736. l. 20. (III. 20, 4.) वृत्तस्य हंता A. B. वृत्तस्य पापस्य हंता C.

P. 737. l. 24. (III. 20, 5.) एवमेकस्मिन्पादे आकारादटि परतः वकारस्य रुत्वधत्वपूर्ववर्णानुनासिकादेशा उच्चेयाः C. एवमेकस्मिन्पादे आकारादटि फलः । अकारस्यतत्त्वधत्वपूर्ववर्णानुनासिका उच्चेयाः A. एवमेकस्मिन्पादे आकारादटि रुत्वपूर्ववर्णानुनासिका उच्चेयाः B.

P. 738. l. 20. (III. 21, 1.) प्रथमः प्रथमं ख्याते प्रथतेस्माद्वितीयादय A. प्रथतेऽस्मात् द्वितीयादय C. प्रथमः प्रथतेस्माद्वितीयादय B.

P. 739. l. 1. (III. 21, 2.) स्वायत्तधर्मेकं added from B. and C. pr. m. संगे A. B.

P. 739. l. 3. (III. 21, 2.) मेदसो मेदोरूपस्य C., but pr. m. वपारूपस्य. मेदसो मेदोपेताः मेदसो मेदोरूपस्य A. B.

P. 739. l. 24. (III. 21, 3.) संतौ भवो भवे छंदसीति etc. संतौ भावः तत्र साधुरिति वा भावे छंदसीति तत्र साधुरिति वा यत्प्रत्ययः A. संतौ भवः तत्र साधुरिति वा भवे छंदसीति तत्र साधुरिति वा यत्प्रत्ययः C. B. : Cf. RV. I. 15, 12.

P. 741. l. 2. (III. 21, 5.) यद्वा to श्रोतंति added from C.

P. 741. l. 6. (III. 21, 5.) दद दान इत्यस्य लटि ङित्त्वादात्मनेपदं A. दद दान इत्यस्य लुङि ङित्त्वादात्मनेपदं C. sec. m. दद has Átmanep. because it is अनुदात्तेत्, Pán. I. 13, 12. डुदात् B.

P. 741. l. 12. (III. 21, 5.) At the end of the 21st Sūkta A. and B. (sec. m.) have खिलं. C. omits the word खिलं, and has instead ब्राह्मणानुसंहितमिदं सूक्तं तत्र ब्राह्मणं पदव्याख्यानात्मकं न भवतीति नात्र लिखितं.

P. 741. l. 25. (III. 22, 1.) सोमं कामयमानं यस्मिन्नग्नौ हुतं सुतं A. सोमं कामयमानः इंद्रं यस्मिन्नग्नौ हुतं सुतं C. सोमं कामनः इंद्रं यस्मिन्नग्नौ सुतं B.

P. 742. l. 1. (III. 22, 1.) तमस्य वेमवशादतनशीलं C. यंतस्य वेगवशदेतनशीलं A. तं अतस्य वेगन् शादतनशीलं B.

P. 742. l. 1. (III. 22, 1.) अश्चमिव. C. inserts after it यद्वा सहस्रिणमिति वाजविशेषणं सहस्रसंख्याकं.

P. 742. l. 2. (III. 22, 1.) सोमाद्यनेकप्रकारं A. C. सोमाद्यनेकरूपं B.

P. 742. l. 14. (III. 22, 2.) आहवनीयादिरूपतया. C. inserts after it दाहपाकादिकर्तृतया.

P. 742. l. 18. (III. 22, 2.) कृतवानसि त्वेवो added from Ca.

P. 743. l. 13. (III. 22, 3.) इति धिष्ण्याः प्राणाभिमानिनो देवाः A. B. इति धिष्ण्याः प्राणाः । यद्वा धिष्ण्याः स्तुतिः तदहोः प्राणाः । ये धिष्ण्याः प्राणाभिमानिनो देवाः C.

P. 743. l. 19. (III. 22, 3.) The text is given from the MSS. of the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa (Mādhyandina Śākhā). The MSS. of the Commentary read, ते हि सर्वा धिय इष्णीति या रोचने परस्मात्तानेष सचते A. B. ते सर्वधियं उष्णीति । तानेष सचते C.

P. 744. l. 2. (III. 22, 3.) ह्रस्वादयः ॥ ह्रस्वत्वादयः A. B. C.

P. 744. l. 12. (III. 22, 4.) With the exception of the words पुरीषमर्हतीति पुरीषे भवा वा,

which are added after पुरीषासः, the whole passage as far as सजोषसः has been given from C. A. omits the whole as far as सजोषसः. पुरीषासः सिकतामिश्राः चित्ताः अग्नयः प्रवणे-  
भिर्मृन्मनसाधनभूतैरभ्यादिभिः सहिताः सजोषसः B.

P. 744. l. 16. (III. 22, 4.) प्रयच्छतां A. B. C. प्रयच्छन्ति शेषः Ca.

P. 745. l. 26. (III. 23, 1.) जूरी घूरी हिंसावयोहान्योः ॥ जूरीमुरी हिंसावयोहान्योः C. pr. m. जृ चत्येयन  
शतृप्रत्ययः A. B. and C. sec. m.; but there would not be a चत्ययः, if शतृ were added  
to जृ; nor could the *u* be explained without the addition of बहुलं छंदसीत्युत्वं. Cf.  
Rv. I. 117, 7.

P. 746. l. 13. (III. 23, 2.) अलूलुडतां C. अलूहतां A. विलूडतां B.

P. 746. l. 20. (III. 23, 2.) The words from रेवत् to अवणे taken from C. B. omits all  
from रेवत् to गतिगंधनयोः.

P. 746. l. 26. (III. 23, 2.) ह्युवाभ्यां चेति भोजसूत्रेण उप्रत्ययः C. ह्युवाभ्यां चेति भोजसूत्रेण प्रत्ययः B.  
ह्युवाभ्यां चेति भोजनसूत्रेण प्रत्ययः A. The Sūtra could not be found.

P. 746. l. 27. (III. 23, 2.) स्वं स्वमभिमत्तं C. स्वं स्वं रत्तं A. B.

P. 747. l. 9. (III. 23, 3.) प्रथनसाधनत्वेन A. प्रथमं B. मथनं C.

P. 747. l. 10. (III. 23, 3.) हे देवश्रवाः. C. adds आत्मन आमतृणं.

P. 747. l. 12. (III. 23, 3.) वशवर्तो A. C. वशकर्ता B.

P. 748. l. 3. (III. 23, 4.) मनुष्यसंचार C. मनुष्यसंचारण B. In A. the passage is omitted.

P. 748. l. 22. (III. 24, 1.) गाथिनो विश्वामित्र A. B. C. गाथिसुतो विश्वामित्र?

P. 749. l. 11. (III. 24, 1.) अस्य लुग्विकरणत्वात्वे न भवतः A. अस्य लुग्विकरणत्वादीत्वेत्वे न भवतः C.

अस्यालुग्विकरणे त्वे न भवतः B.

P. 749. l. 23. (III. 24, 2.) यज्ञेषु प्रीतिमान् ॥ यज्ञेषु inserted from C.

P. 749. l. 23. (III. 24, 2.) इलायामीड्यायां ॥ इलायां inserted from C.

P. 750. l. 10. (III. 24, 3.) अग्ने मम मत्तंबंधिन्यस्मिन्यज्ञे ॥ अग्ने त्वं मम संबंध्यस्मिन्यज्ञे C, अग्ने मम  
संबंध्यस्मिन्यज्ञे A. B.

P. 750. l. 11. (III. 24, 3.) जृशृसृजागृभ्यः ॥ जागृभ्यः A. B. सजागृभ्यः C.

P. 751. l. 26. (III. 25, 1.) तनयोऽसि. C. has after it द्यावापृथिवीभ्यां वा एवं जातां देवाः पर्यगृह्णन्ति  
श्रुतेः जातस्याग्नेः परियहाज्जननीवन्नयोर्मातृत्वं इत्यर्थः.

P. 755. l. 3. (III. 26, 1.) विश्वानरोऽग्निः ॥ विश्वानरः कश्चि C. B. विश्वानरः कश्चित् Ca. A.

P. 756. l. 3. (III. 26, 2.) यद्वा स्यदःशब्देनाध्या लक्ष्यते B. यद्वा स्यशब्देन द्वां लक्ष्यते A. यद्वा स्यद-  
शब्देन तद्वाँल्लक्ष्यते C.

P. 756. l. 19. (III. 26, 3.) A. omits all between प्रतिदिनं समिध्यते and अयुंजन् in verse 4.

P. 756. l. 21. (III. 26, 3.) जातो B. आत्मजातो C.

P. 757. l. 16. (III. 26, 4.) चालयंति ॥ बालयंति A. B. चालयंति C.

P. 757. l. 17. (III. 26, 4.) अस्माच्चवेर्निष्ठेति A. B. C. The Unādi-sūtra I. 48. is तवेर्णिष्ठा;  
Sāyaṇa has changed it to explain the accent. Cf. Rv. I. 35, 4.

P. 757. l. 19. (III. 26, 4.) पृषु सेचने ॥ पृष सेचने C. पृष संधाने A. B.

P. 758. l. 25. (III. 26, 6.) मारुतं तेजो याचामहे. C. has after it यद्वा त्रातं त्रातं बारकं गणं गणं  
सप्त गणान् ओजो बलं याचामहे.

## P R E F A C E.

P. 759. l. 19. (III. 26, 7.) स त्रेधात्मानं व्यभजत् । आदित्यं तृतीयं A. स त्रेधात्मानं व्यभजत् आदित्यं द्वितीयं (sec. m., but तृतीयं pr. m.) C. स त्रेधात्मानं विभजत् आदित्यं तृतीयं B. The margin of B. adds आग्नं तृतीयं.

P. 759. l. 20. (III. 26, 7.) अवयमननादिनिरपेक्षेण स्वभावसाक्षात्° A. अवयमननादिनिरपेक्षेण स्वभाव एव साक्षात्° C. अवयमननादिसाधननिरपेक्षेण स्वभावसाक्षात् B.

P. 759. l. 23. (III. 26, 7.) भोगात्मकं A. C. भोगार्थकं B.

P. 759. l. 24. (III. 26, 7.) अभिधाय वायुात्मनांतरिक्षाधिष्ठातृतां inserted from C.

P. 761. l. 2. (III. 26, 8.) अर्चनीयं. C. adds after it निरतिशयानंदलक्षणं.

P. 761. l. 6. (III. 26, 8.) सर्वजगच्च पर्यपश्यत् । परितः सर्वतः स्वात्मतयादर्शत् C. जगत् पर्यपश्यत् सर्वतः प्राप्नोतिपादार्शत् B. In A. the passage is omitted.

P. 761. l. 23. (III. 26, 9.) न कदापि A. C. न क्वापि B.

P. 761. l. 23. (III. 26, 9.) उत्सं. C. has after it लुप्तोपममेतत्.

P. 762. l. 2. (III. 26, 9.) अस्मादुदियमिमृदिभ्यकृषिभ्यः A. अस्मादुदियमिमृदिभ्यः C. अस्मादुदियमिग-  
दिकृषिभ्यः B. अमि is added here as the radical of अंस. Instead of गुषि, as printed in the Unādi-text (ed. Boehtlingk), गुषि has been adopted from the MS. of Ujjvaladatta.

P. 762. l. 28. (III. 27, 1.) इति तिस्रः सामिधेयः. The two last words were inserted from C., where however they are struck out sec. m.

P. 763. l. 8. (III. 27, 1.) After अंचति C. adds जारयति.

P. 763. l. 15. (III. 27, 1.) सुस्रयुरिति. Ca. has after it आग्नेयपक्षे । हेऽग्ने वस्त्वदर्धमभिद्यवोऽभि-  
गतदीपयो हविष्यंत आसादितैश्चरुपुरोडाशादिभिः सहिता वाजा अन्नानि समिद्धक्षानि घृताभ्या जुह्वा सह प्रक्रम्यते ।  
प्र वो वाजा इत्यन्वाहाबं वै वाज इति देवान[ं] देवान् । समानमन्यत्.

P. 764. l. 5. (III. 27, 2.) पूर्वपदप्रकृतिस्वरः. Ca. has after it यद्वा उभयत्र छंदसीवनिपायितं वनिप्.

P. 764. l. 25. (III. 27, 4.) शोचिष्केशः ज्वालाकेशः C. शोचिष्केशः दीपज्वालः B. In A. no explanation is given.

P. 765. l. 2. (III. 27, 4.) याच्यार्थः ॥ याच्यार्थः A. B. C.

P. 765. l. 8. (III. 27, 5.) घृतस्य विलयनद्वारा शोधनं येनेति A. C. घृतस्य विलयनद्वारा घृतशोधक इति B.

P. 769. l. 12. (III. 27, 13.) वृषु सेचने corrected. वृषी सेचने A. B. C.

P. 769. l. 21. (III. 27, 14.) तद्वत् C. तद्वतो A. B.

P. 770. l. 6. (III. 27, 15.) वृषणो वृषाणो A. वृषाणो omitted by B. C.

P. 770. l. 7. (III. 27, 15.) आहुतिद्वारा A. C. वृष्टिद्वारा B. sec. m.

P. 772. l. 4. (III. 28, 3.) तिरोहिते सति. Ca. adds पूर्वेषु स्मृतीयसवनेऽभिपुतं परेषुः प्रातःकाले हूयमा-  
नमीदृशं सोमं.

P. 772. l. 17. (III. 28, 4.) मार्ष्यंदिने मर्ष्यंदिनसंबंधिनि ॥ मार्ष्यंदिनसंबंधिनि A. B. C.

P. 773. l. 14. (III. 28, 5.) अन्निति तत्र नानुवर्तनात् ॥ अणिति तत्रानुवर्तनात् A. In C. अणिति is left out, but supplied in the margin. In B. all is wanting. The quotation seems to refer to Pāṇ. V. 3, 48.

P. 774. l. 18. (III. 29, 1.) प्रजननमग्निजननसाधन C. प्रजननमग्नेर्जलनसाधन B. प्रजननसाधन A.

P. 776. l. 1. (III. 29, 3.) उह्रवेद्या उत्पन्नो added from C.

P. 777. l. 7. (III. 29, 5.) मनसा वाचा चैकविधमेव कर्म कुर्वणं inserted from C.

P. 777. l. 10. (III. 29, 5.) अग्निपूर्वकत्वात्सर्वेषामुत्तरक्रतूनां A. C. अग्निपूर्वकत्वात्सर्वमुत्तरक्रतूनां B.  
 P. 778. l. 4. (III. 29, 6.) बाह्यालीस्थानेषु C. बाह्यालीस्थानेषु A. बाह्यास्थलीस्थानेषु B.  
 P. 778. l. 5. (III. 29, 6.) यामन् यामनि वेगगमने A. C. यामन् याने विशेषवेगगमने B.  
 P. 778. l. 7. (III. 29, 6.) तृणानि च A. C. तृणानीव B.  
 P. 778. l. 8. (III. 29, 6.) दग्धस्थानानि C. दग्धस्थानानि A. तदंतश्चे स्थानानि B.  
 P. 779. l. 8. (III. 29, 8.) उन्नरवेद्या नाभौ B. उन्नरवेद्यां नाभौ A. C.  
 P. 779. l. 10. (III. 29, 8.) सुकृतजन्योपभोगस्य A. C. सुकृतजन्योपभोगस्य C. sec. m. कृतजन्योप-  
 भोगस्य B.

P. 779. l. 23. (III. 29, 9.) The words धुनोति कंपयतीति धूमोऽग्निः। एवंविधं are added from C. In A. these and the following words are omitted.

P. 780. l. 20. (III. 29, 10.) यद्वा to वर्धय wanting in B. After यद्वा C. has गृ शब्दे। गृणांतीति गिरः स्रोताः। पाठः.

P. 781. l. 17. (III. 29, 11.) पा रक्षणे यद् गतौ पातेः क्तिन् A. पा रक्षणे यद् गतौ वा ख्यंतः क्तिप् C. pr. m.; वा is struck out sec. m. पा रक्षणे यद् गतौ पातेः क्तिन् B.

P. 781. l. 27. (III. 29, 11.) हृमृमृसृशृभ्य इति ईमनिन् A. B. C. The Unādi-sūtra IV. 149. has हृमृमृसृशृभ्य इमनिच्. Cf. Rv. I. 55, 2, where वरीमन् is said to be formed by the औणादिक ईमनिन्प्रत्ययः. From the root सू, सर्वीमन् is formed.

P. 782. l. 23. (III. 29, 13.) अग्रुवः. The etymological explanation is given only by C. In A. the whole passage is wanting.

P. 782. l. 25. (III. 29, 13.) हर्षाद्वस्त्रद्वयसंपुटेन शब्दं कुर्वति A. Ca. हविर्शब्दं कुर्वति B.

P. 782. l. 26. (III. 29, 13.) हर्षादुद्घोषंति C. हर्षंति घोषंति A. B.

P. 786. l. 22. (III. 30, 1.) प्रयांसीतराख्यपि. C. adds after it धानाकरंभादीनि.

P. 787. l. 2. (III. 30, 1.) सोमपदस्येतरवाक्ये A. B. सोमपदस्योत्तरवाक्ये C.

P. 788. l. 3. (III. 30, 3.) वृषभ कामानां वर्षक हे इन्द्र यस्त्वं omitted in C.

P. 788. l. 7. (III. 30, 3.) After तुविकूर्मिः there is a lacuna in A. B., which is supplied by Ca. in the following way: संग्रामे नानाविधकर्मणां कर्ता च्छावान् शत्रुविषयहिंसावान् भवतीति शेषः प्रत्यक्षकृतः। हे वृषभ कामानां वर्षक अत एव उग्रः etc. The passage, however, has been given according to C 2.

P. 788. l. 23. (III. 30, 4.) अच्युतानि च्युतिरहितानि C. अच्युतानि च्यवनरहितानि B. अच्युतानि रहितानि A.

P. 789. l. 4. (III. 30, 4.) हंतीति A. C. जिघ्रतीति B.

P. 789. l. 20. (III. 30, 5.) करोषीति यावत् ॥ करोषीति यत् A. B. करोषीति यत् C.

P. 789. l. 20. (III. 30, 5.) लोके प्रसिद्ध एव C. लोके प्रसिद्धः प्रभावः A. B.

P. 790. l. 6. (III. 30, 6.) शत्रून्भिलक्ष्य A. C. अस्मानभिलक्ष्य B.

P. 790. l. 8. (III. 30, 6.) प्रमृणन् हिंसन्. हिंसन् added from C.

P. 790. l. 9. (III. 30, 6.) पलायनपरांश्च A. B. पलायनपरायणांश्च C.

P. 790. l. 14. (III. 30, 6.) आभाछास्त्रस्य B. ति अभ्याछयस्य A. आभाछास्त्रीयाम्य C.

P. 790. l. 23. (III. 30, 7.) निरंतरमैश्वर्यं A. B. निरतिशयमैश्वर्यं C.

P. 791. l. 16. (III. 30, 8.) कंचिदसुरं. C. adds त्वाष्ट्रं वृत्तं.



P. 791. l. 25. (III. 30, 8.) कुण शब्दने A. B. कुण संशब्दने C. The Dhātupāṭha has कुण शब्दोपकरणयोः.

P. 792. l. 6. (III. 30, 9.) अपारां. C. has after it दूडंरुपारां, i. e. दूरपारां.

P. 792. l. 7. (III. 30, 9.) भूमिं सामनां समानां C 2. भूमिं सामानां Ca. भूमिं सामनां B. भूमिं समेनां A.

P. 792. l. 8. (III. 30, 9.) यद्वा सम एव साम A. C. यद्वा सम एव सामनुः B. pr. m. साम sec. m.

P. 792. l. 9. (III. 30, 9.) तस्माद्धेव साम इति C. तस्माद्धचसमे A. तस्माद्धचसमे B. pr. m. तस्माद्धेव साम C 2.

P. 792. l. 10. (III. 30, 9.) साम्यवती ॥ साम्यवती C. B. साम्यवती Ca. सम्यवती A.

P. 792. l. 12. (III. 30, 9.) तथांतरिखं to आगच्छतु only in C.

P. 792. l. 15. (III. 30, 9.) सम एव सामः C. सम एव सामं A. B.

P. 792. l. 15. (III. 30, 9.) इष गतौ ॥ इषु गतौ A. B. इषि गतौ C.

P. 792. l. 18. (III. 30, 9.) संभु संभन A. B. संभु रोधन C.

P. 792. l. 21. (III. 30, 9.) क्तिप् धातोर्ह्रस्वश्च B. क्तिप् धातोर्ह्रस्वश्च A. क्तिप् ह्रस्वश्चेति क्तिप् धातोर्ह्रस्वश्च C. Cf. Unādi-sūtra II. 59.

P. 793. l. 6. (III. 30, 10.) पुरा हंतोस्तव वज्रप्रहारात्माक् A. B. एतादृशो मेघः पुरो हंतोः हननात् वज्र-प्रहारात्माक् C.

P. 793. l. 6. (III. 30, 10.) विसिष्टो A. विशिष्टो B. विस्त्रिष्टो C.

P. 793. l. 14. (III. 30, 10.) धमतिर्गैतिकर्मा. C. has after it सुरः हननात्माक् विविधमगच्छत् तं हत्वा गतिर्गमयितुमागच्छति.

P. 793. l. 16. (III. 30, 10.) वल्यते ॥ C. adds यद्वा गोर्जात्येकवचनं गवां व्रजो गोष्ठभूतो वलो नामाक-रोदिंद्रः तं पुरुहूतं शब्दायमानास्ता गावोऽभ्यगच्छते आद्याद्यते etc.

P. 794. l. 12. (III. 30, 11.) After शीघ्रमागच्छेति भावः Ca. adds यद्वा संगतानि वाजानन्तानि अंतरि-च्छादाहत्यास्नानभि प्रापयेति शेषः.

P. 795. l. 11. (III. 30, 13.) Between वि and वस्त्राः Ca. adds पाठ। अक्तोः रात्रेः यामन् यामनि निर्गमने सति विवस्त्रास्तमांसि विवासनवत्ता उपसः. It is one of the many marginal notes which are found in Ca., but which do not occur in the other C. MSS.

P. 795. l. 13. (III. 30, 13.) उपःकालः Ca. काल A. काले B. C.

P. 795. l. 14. (III. 30, 13.) आगात् व्यैति तदा A. B. C. आगतः तदा Ca.

P. 795. l. 16. (III. 30, 13.) After इन्द्रस्य तवै, Ca. adds यद्वा महिना महिना युक्तः आगादिति संबंधः तानीन्द्रस्य कर्म कर्मणि सुकृता सुष्ठु कृतानि पुरुणि बहूनि विद्यन्ते पाठः.

P. 796. l. 3. (III. 30, 14.) यद्यस्मादुदकात्स्नात् स्नादुतरं संभृतं स्नेन संपादितं ॥ यद्यस्मादुदकात्स्नादुतरं संभृतं संपादितं A. यद्यस्मादुदकात्स्नात् स्नादुत्वरं संवृतं स्नेन संपादितं Ca. यथा स्नादुदकः स्ना तस्मादुत्वरं संभृतं स्नेन संपादितं C. यद्यस्मादुदकात्स्ना स्नादुतरं संभृतं स्नेन संपादितं B.

P. 796. l. 20. (III. 30, 15.) दुष्टमायुधानि B. दुष्टं माधानि A. C. दुष्टशब्दायमानाः माधानि Ca.

P. 796. l. 23. (III. 30, 15.) हह हहि वृह वृह वृद्धौ A. हहि वृह वृह वृद्धौ A. हह हहि वृद्धौ B.

P. 796. l. 28. (III. 30, 15.) After रिपवः A. has रपवचवसिचक्ते; Ca. रपवसिचक्ते; C. पच वच-सिचोपधाया; B. sec. m. रप हिंसायां. Might it be रप वचसि चक्ते?

P. 797. l. 14. (III. 30, 16.) After नय Ca. adds शतून्वा वशं नय.

P. 798. l. 2. (III. 30, 17.) कियतोऽभिज्ञायमाण C. कियतो भिज्ञायमान B. कियतो भिज्ञायमाण A.

P. 798. l. 24. (III. 30, 18.) After भवेम Ca. adds यद्वा प्रयेतः स्वस्येऽस्माकं च । जितरुवं यदा महंति बहूनि हवीरूपायन्नानि समासीदसि तदा वयं बृहतो महतो ण्यो धनस्य संभक्तारो भवेम.

P. 799. l. 14. (III. 30, 19.) गादाभ्यामिष्णुजितीष्णच् Ca. A. गादाभ्यामिष्णुजितीष्णच् C. B.

P. 799. l. 16. (III. 30, 19.) सीयुट आर्द्धधा° A. B. C. सीयुटः सलोपः आर्द्धधा° B. sec. m.

P. 800. l. 4. (III. 30, 20.) प्रस्थाने । सिप् ॥ प्रस्थाने । किप् A.

P. 800. l. 13. (III. 30, 21.) विदारय before आद्वियस Ca.

P. 802. l. 3-5. (III. 31, 1.) शासद्विहित्युच्यते B. All between is left out. In C. the commentary on verse 1. and part of verse 2. is omitted.

P. 802. l. 6. (III. 31, 1.) स मे पुत्रः पुत्रो भवेदिति ॥ पुत्रो पुत्रो भवेत्° A. पुत्रो भवेत् B. Ca. Cf. Manu, IX. 127.

P. 802. l. 7. (III. 31, 1.) नप्यं नमृभवं पिंडदानादिकं कर्तव्यतया गात् गच्छति B. नप्यं नमरं पौत्रं गात् गच्छति । दुहितुः पुत्रत्वेन स्त्रीकाराद्द्वैहितं नमृभवं पिंडदानादिकं कर्तव्यतया गात् गच्छति A. Ca. After गच्छति A. and Ca. add कर्तुंके पिंडदानादिकं गच्छतीत्यर्थः पाठः.

P. 802. l. 11. (III. 31, 1.) तत्पतिं ॥ यत् पतिं A. Ca. विट्पतिं B.

P. 802. l. 11. (III. 31, 1.) यत्र यस्या दुहितुः B. The first explanation from यत्र यस्मिन्विषये to दुःस्वापगमात् is given in A. and Ca.

P. 802. l. 16. (III. 31, 1.) तया स्वशरीरं A. C. तस्यां स्ववीर्यं B.

P. 803. l. 12. (III. 31, 2.) तु तुरीयकं Ca. तुरीयकं A. तु तृतीयकं B.

P. 803. l. 14. (III. 31, 2.) वह्निं । अविह्निः स्त्री वह्निः पुमान् स्वभाषीया वोदृत्वात् अवह्निश्च वह्निः A. Ca. वह्निः स्त्री वह्निः पुमान् स्वभाषीया उदर्थत्वात् अवह्निश्च B. The Commentary to the Nirukta says, वह्निं च बध्ना वोढारं पुत्रं अवह्निं चावोद्री स्त्रियं । तयोर्द्वयोरपि वोद्वोद्वोः पुत्रयोरन्यतरः etc.

P. 804. l. 2. (III. 31, 2.) जनेर्णिचि ॥ जनेर्लिङि B. जनेर्लेटि C. जने लीट A.

P. 804. l. 10. (III. 31, 3.) कंपमानो ॥ कं भजयमानो Ca. कं भजयमानो A. कंपमानो B.

P. 807. l. 12. (III. 31, 7.) घूद् निरासे A. C. खरणे B.

P. 807. l. 16. (III. 31, 7.) सन्निधौ B. C. सन्निधौ Ca. सन्निधौ A.

P. 807. l. 25. (III. 31, 8.) सर्वमिति प्रतिमानं प्रतिनिधिः ॥ प्रतिनिधिः सर्वमिति प्रतिमानं A. Ca. सर्वमिति प्रतिमानं B. C.

P. 809. l. 15. (III. 31, 10.) ते व्याप्तावतिष्ठ ॥ ते व्याप्रा वर्तिताः A. ते व्याप्रा वर्तिताः B. ते व्याप्तावतिष्ठ C.

P. 809. l. 23. (III. 31, 10.) युष संशब्दने A. C. युषिर विशब्दने B.

P. 810. l. 9. (III. 31, 11.) क्रमेणसु वसतीति A. B. क्रमेण हविषसु भवतीति Ca. क्रमेण हविष्यासु वतीति C.

P. 810. l. 15. (III. 31, 11.) स्वार्थे घप्रत्ययः Ca. स्वार्थे वृषोदरादत्वात् घप्रत्ययः A. स्वार्थे वृषोदरादित्वात्स्वार्थे घप्रत्ययः C. स्वार्थे वृषोदरादित्वात् घप्रत्ययः B.

P. 811. l. 3. (III. 31, 12.) संतरिक्षेण विष्कभंतो A. B. संतरिक्षेण यत्नेन वा विष्कभंतो Ca.

P. 811. l. 5. (III. 31, 12.) After अस्यापयन् Ca. adds यज्ञैरेव लोकस्थितिरिन्द्रस्य च वृद्धिरिति कीर्तत.

P. 811. l. 8. (III. 31, 12.) Between रोधने and इति निपातनात् all is omitted in A. B.

P. 811. l. 21. (III. 31, 13.) धात् । अकरोत् B. धात् A. C. धात् धारयेत् Ca.

P. 812. l. 12. (III. 31, 14.) प्रापयामः ॥ प्रापयामः हे Ca. प्रापयामहे C. प्रापयामहे A. याचामहे B.

P. 814. l. 8. (III. 31, 17.) कृषो ॥ C. adds कृषा चाकृषा च कृषो.

P. 814. l. 9. (III. 31, 17.) चतुर्गतयः ॥ C. adds यद्वा चतुर्गतयः चतुर्कर्मण इत्यर्थः.

P. 815. l. 20. (III. 31, 19.) सन्यसे to इत्यर्थः added from C.

P. 816. l. 20. (III. 31, 21.) दिशतु A. B. C. अदिशत् Ca.

P. 816. l. 23. (III. 31, 21.) Before वने गाः etc. Ca. adds द्वापर्युद्वाद्य गा निरामयदित्यर्थः.

P. 820. l. 2. (III. 32, 5.) After हर्षश्च B. adds हरितवर्णश्चोपेत.

P. 820. l. 21. (III. 32, 6.) वधेन युद्धेन A. B. C. वधेनायुधेन?

P. 821. l. 17. (III. 32, 7.) अपरिमिते रोदसी added from B.

P. 826. l. 4. (III. 32, 14.) Before आह्वयंति Ca. adds धारणां. The passage is left out in A.

P. 826. l. 23. (III. 32, 15.) तं सोमं चोदिताधारे सिंचामि ॥ तं सोमं added from C.

P. 827. l. 14. (III. 32, 16.) सखिभ्यः सखिभिः. Ca. inserts सखीभूपर्वतैर्हृदीकृतमपि गन्धं गोसंबन्धिनमूर्ध्वं गणमारुह्यः आभग्नवानसि यदा वलेन रुद्धा गाः जेतुमंगिरसां कृते प्रवृद्धोऽसि तदा सर्वेऽपि त्वां न वारयंतीत्यर्थः.

P. 828. l. 12. (III. 33, 1.) संभेदमाययावनययुरितरे। अथ A. C. संभेदमाग्नोत्तितीर्षुः B.

P. 828. l. 26. (III. 33, 1.) कूलविपाटनात् विपाशनाद्वा विमोचनाद्वा. The MSS. insert after विपाशनाद्वा the following words: हतपुत्रोऽभूत् तमोवृक्षेर्मुषोर्वैसिष्ठस्य पाशा अस्यां व्यपाश्यन्त. Cf. Durga's Commentary on Nir. IX. 26: विपाशनाद्वा। किमस्यां व्यपाश्यत्। पाशा अस्यां व्यपाश्यन्त वसिष्ठस्य मुमूर्षतः। वसिष्ठः किल निमज्जास्यां मुमुषुः पुत्रमरणशोकात्तैः पाशैरात्मानं बद्धा। तस्य किल ते पाशा अस्यां व्यपाश्यन्त व्यमुच्यन्तोदकेन.

P. 833. l. 14. (III. 33, 7.) Ca. adds at the beginning of the verse इदमृषेवैकं.

P. 834. l. 8. (III. 33, 8.) यत्संवादात्मकं ॥ Ca. has after it इदमाहात्म्यप्रकाशनरूपं वा.

P. 834. l. 8. (III. 33, 8.) नोऽभीष्ट ॥ नोधिष इत्या A. नाधीष इत्या C. मनीषा इत्यादि B.

P. 836. l. 22. (III. 33, 11.) उन्नीयौ भवेयुः ॥ Ca. adds तथा कुर्विति शेषः.

P. 837. l. 14. (III. 33, 12.) Ca. has at the beginning इदमुन्नीयैस्य विश्रामितस्य वाक्यं.

P. 838. l. 6. (III. 33, 13.) पूर्वमुत्तितीर्षुर्विश्रामितो नदीरुक्थाधुनोत्तितीर्षुः A. B. पूर्वमुन्नीयौ विश्रामितो नदीरुक्थाधुनोत्तितीर्षुः C.

P. 838. l. 7. (III. 33, 13.) युगकीला deest in A. B. C. युग्यकं C. युग्यकं A. युग्यकं B.

P. 839. l. 17. (III. 34, 1.) वावृधानो वर्षमानो A. Ca. वावृधानो वर्षयमानो C. वावृधानो वर्षनशीलो B. marg.

P. 839. l. 17. (III. 34, 1.) भूरिदातः। दायते etc. A. C. भूरिदातो बहुच्छेदनसाधनयुक्तः B. marg.

P. 839. l. 19. (III. 34, 1.) आपृणत्। सर्वतोऽन्तर्पयत् C. आपृणत्। स्वप्रकाशेन पूरितवान् B. marg.; omitted in A.

P. 840. l. 10. (III. 34, 2.) तहेर्हैलोपश्च ॥ महेर्हैलोपश्च A. B. C.

P. 841. l. 13. (III. 34, 2.) धेना जिगातीत्यत्र प्रत्ययस्वरैणातोदात्तः. In the passage quoted by Sáyana धेना is ádyudátta, as it ought to be, if निच is anuvṛtta.

P. 842. l. 3. (III. 34, 4.) कृप्यां किन्त्. This Sūtra does not exist in the Unádi-sūtras; cf. III. 148.

P. 844. l. 24. (III. 34, 8.) धिया स्तुता रण्यन्तः स्तोताः A. B. धिया स्तुता कर्मणा वा रणं येषां ते स्तोताः Ca.

P. 845. l. 2. (III. 34, 8.) ससान तत्तल्लोकात्वाग्निभ्यो ददौ A. ससान लोकवासिभ्यो ददौ B. ससान तत्तल्लोकावासिभ्यो ददौ C. ससान असुरेभ्यः समाहृत्य देवेभ्यो ददौ सततल्लोकावासिभ्यो ददौ Ca.

- P. 848. l. 19. (III. 35, 3.) विषसं A. C. व्यसं Ca. यसं B.  
 P. 849. l. 12. (III. 35, 4.) समानप्रसिद्धी ॥ Ca. inserts before it वेगबलयोः.  
 P. 849. l. 14. (III. 35, 4.) सुषुद्धारं A. B. C. सुखकरं Ca.  
 P. 853. l. 23. (III. 36, 1.) सुते सुते ॥ Ca. has after it परोऽङ्घ्रिः परोक्षकृतः.  
 P. 857. l. 4. (III. 36, 6.) रथ्येव रथिन इव ॥ Ca. adds गंतव्यं देशं.  
 P. 857. l. 6. (III. 36, 6.) लताखंडरूपोऽस्यः सोमः A. लताखंडोपेतः सोमः Ca. लताखंडपात्यः सोमः C.

लताखंडजः सोमः B.

- P. 861. l. 24. (III. 37, 4.) आकृषति ॥ आकृषति A. B. C.  
 P. 863. l. 2. (III. 37, 7.) पृतनानामाज्यं पृतनाज्यं ॥ पृतनाज्यं deest in A. B. C.  
 P. 863. l. 26. (III. 37, 9.) निषादपंचमेषु चतुर्षु जनेषु A. B. वक्षुरादिषु स्थानेषु Ca.  
 P. 865. l. 13. (III. 38, 1.) काष्ठं संस्फोटति A. B. रथं संस्फोटति Ca. The same has after  
 तद्वत् the words अस्मा इदु स्तोमं संहिनोमि रथं न तष्टेवेति निगमः.

- P. 867. l. 21. (III. 38, 4.) आच्छादयन् added from Ca. B. has धार्यमानः.  
 P. 867. l. 24. (III. 38, 4.) महदाश्रयोपेतं A. B. महदाश्रयोपेतं C.  
 P. 868. l. 10. (III. 38, 5.) Before वृषभः A. B. C. (but not Ca.) have तयोः पूर्वः.  
 P. 870. l. 8. (III. 38, 8.) अमतिं दीप्तिं C. अमतिं कान्तिं A. B.  
 P. 873. l. 11. (III. 39, 3.) शस्त्रादीनि कर्माणि ॥ Ca. adds यद्वा वपुंषि रूपाणि.  
 P. 875. l. 13. (III. 39, 6.) उत्साविण्यां भोगवत्यां गवि ॥ उत्साविण्यां गवि B. उत्सावि गवि A. C.  
 P. 882. l. 18. (III. 41, 2.) स्तीर्यैमभूत् ॥ स्तीर्यै मरुतं A. स्तीर्यैमत Ca. स्तीर्यै मरुत् C. स्तीर्यै B.  
 P. 886. l. 21. (III. 42, 2.) नृमन ॥ नृत मन B. नृनमन A. नृनमन C.  
 P. 887. l. 20. (III. 42, 5.) अन्नधन Ca. सेनाधन B. sec. m. निधने A. C.  
 P. 889. l. 15. (III. 43, 1.) ऽप्यावपनीयं added from Ca.  
 P. 889. l. 22. (III. 43, 4.) आ अभिलक्ष्य ॥ अनु अभिलक्ष्य A. B. C.  
 P. 890. l. 14. (III. 43, 2.) कल्ले supplied from C.  
 P. 891. l. 14. (III. 43, 4.) अथ धानावत्. After अथ Ca. has परोक्षस्तुतिः.  
 P. 891. l. 23. (III. 43, 5.) After हे इंद्र कुवित् Ca. adds अत कुविच्छन्दः कदा इत्यर्थे वतीते बहुवाची वा.  
 P. 895. l. 20. (III. 44, 4.) प्राणहारकं C. प्राणपहारं B. प्रहारकं A.  
 P. 896. l. 5. (III. 44, 5.) अभिषुतं सोममपावृणोत् ॥ अभिषुतमपावृणोत् A. B. C.  
 P. 896. l. 14. (III. 45, 1.) श्रुत्वा A. B. श्रौतो C.  
 P. 896. l. 14. (III. 45, 1.) स्मार्तं C. शास्त्रं A. B.  
 P. 896. l. 24. (III. 45, 1.) अतिगच्छन्ति ॥ अभिगच्छन्ति A. B. C.  
 P. 909. l. 16. (III. 49, 2.) युद्धमासाद्य B. युमासाद्य A. युद्धस्य मध्ये C.  
 P. 909. l. 18. (III. 49, 2.) न कोऽप्यभ्यस्तीत्यर्थः ॥ न कोऽप्यस्तीत्यर्थः A. B. C.  
 P. 910. l. 3. (III. 49, 3.) सहवा बलवान् A. C. सहवा सहायवान् बलवान् B.  
 P. 910. l. 23. (III. 49, 4.) पृष्टः ॥ Ca. adds व्याप्तः.  
 P. 916. l. 4. (III. 51, 3.) सत्तासाहं शत्रूणामेव हंतारं A. B. सत्तासाहं सत्यमेव शत्रूणामभिभवितां C.  
 P. 919. l. 22. (III. 51, 9.) इदमनु अनेनानुक्रमेण उद्देशानुक्रमेणेत्यर्थः C. इदमनु अनेनानुक्रमेणेत्यर्थः Ca.  
 इदमनु क्रमेण उद्देशानुक्रमेणेत्यर्थः A. B.  
 P. 923. l. 1. (III. 52, 6.) After महय Ca. adds संभावय.

- P. 924. l. 9. (III. 53, 1.) ससर्पैर्यै ॥ ससर्पैर्यै A. B. ससर्पैर्यै C. and the Anukramanī.  
 P. 925. l. 1. (III. 53, 2.) हारियोजनस्य added from C.  
 P. 925. l. 26. (III. 53, 3.) दास्व A. C. वदस्व B.  
 P. 926. l. 13. (III. 53, 4.) Ca. adds after तत्र गृह एव the words यत्र ते जाया तिष्ठति.  
 P. 927. l. 5. (III. 53, 5.) अत्र स्थितौ रासभस्य हेषारवं कुर्वतो वाजिनोऽश्वस्य रयाद्विमोचनं प्रयोजनं C. वाजिनः अश्वाः तेषां विमोचनं अत्र स्थितौ रासभस्य शब्दयुक्तस्य रूपस्य B.; omitted in A.  
 P. 927. l. 19. (III. 53, 6.) यद्वा सुराणं सुरमणीयं यथा भवति तथा गृहे जाया तिष्ठति added from C. See the grammatical explanation.

P. 927. l. 25. (III. 53, 6.) Instead of प्रत्ययस्य (C.) A. has गव्ययसि, B. गव्ययसि. Before प्रत्ययस्य a grammatical explanation seems to have been omitted, which might be supplied in the following manner: यद्वा रणो रमणीयः । वशिष्ठस्योरूपसंख्यानमित्यप्.

P. 930. l. 26. (III. 53, 12.) स्तावयामि C. स्तौमि A. B.

P. 932. l. 2. (III. 53, 14.) शूद्रापत्यैश्च C. शूद्रवित्तैश्च A. B.

P. 932. l. 3. (III. 53, 14.) पातकहेतुत्वेन स्मरणात् । पतितस्य संबंधि धनं नैचाशाखं A. B. पातकहेतुत्वेन स नीचाशाखः । तत्संबन्धिधनं नैचाशाखं C.

P. 932. l. 7. (III. 53, 14.) प्रेस्वो वा A. C. प्रेस्वा वा B., which is supported by the authority of the Nirukta and Nirukta-bhāshya.

P. 932. l. 8. (III. 53, 14.) घरणं A. C. हरणं B. हर्ष्ये Nirukta.

P. 932. l. 11. (III. 53, 14.) तत्स्यं A. B. तत्सं C. The MSS. of the Nirukta (E. I. H. 1378. and MS. Paris.) have तत्स्यं; Roth's edition gives तत्संभे.

P. 932. l. 17-20. (III. 53, 15.) The Ślokās are taken from C. They are to be found in Shadguruśishya's commentary on the Anukramanī.

P. 935. l. 27. (III. 53, 21.) The commentary on verses 21—24. was omitted by the writer of A 2. The copyist of MS. Pada 1. omitted the whole 23rd Varga, probably for the same reason for which Durga abstained from explaining the second Páda of verse 23. This occurs Nir. IV. 14, but Durga declines to explain it because the passage is supposed to contain a curse on Vasishṭha, Vasishṭha being the ancestor of the family to which Durga himself belonged. Durga says, यस्मिन्निगम एव शब्दः (लोभः) सा वसिष्ठेऽपिणी चृक् अहं च कापिष्ठलो वासिष्ठः अतस्तां न निर्वीचीमि ॥ In the Anukramanī also it is said, अंता अभिज्ञापायीः । ता वसिष्ठेऽपिण्यः । न वसिष्ठाः शृण्वन्ति । and Shadguruśishya adds the following quotation from Śaunaka's Bṛihaddevatā to the same effect:

शतधा भिद्यते मूढा कीर्तनेन<sup>i</sup> श्रुतेन च । तेषां बालाः प्रसीयन्ते<sup>k</sup> तस्माद्वास्तु न कीर्तयेत् ॥

P. 935. l. 27. (III. 53, 21.) पुरा खलु only in C.—P. 936. l. 1. केनचित्कालेन only in C.—P. 936. l. 2. चरिभिः only in C.—P. 936. l. 2. अभिज्ञापकपास्ता only in C.—P. 936. l. 9. शौर्येवन् only in C.—P. 936. l. 10. यातयति to लुक् only in C.—P. 936. l. 13. प्रशस्यतराभिः only in C.—P. 936. l. 13. द्वेषो only in C.—P. 936. l. 15. पंचवृत्तिः only in C.

<sup>i</sup> कीर्तितौ च MS. E. I. H. 1823. कीर्तनेन 2396.

<sup>k</sup> प्रसीयन्ते E. I. H. 1823. प्रमायन्ते 2396.

- P. 936. l. 22. (III. 53, 22.) चिच्छब्द उपमार्थः । यथा परशुं only in C.—P. 936. l. 23. शास्मली B. —P. 936. l. 25. प्रयस्ता आपहता B. हे प्रयस्तापहता C.—P. 936. l. 26. फेनं मुखात् B. पतुमुखात् C.
- P. 937. l. 6. (III. 53, 23.) पुरा खलु only in C.—P. 937. l. 6. प्रयात् B. प्रापत् C.—P. 937. l. 6. मौनिनं only in C.—P. 937. l. 8. मंत्रगणसामर्थ्यं C. मंत्रसामर्थ्यं B.—P. 937. l. 9. पशु मन्यमानाः । पशु इति निपातः पशुशब्दसमामार्थः । पशुभिः वाञ्छ (perhaps पशुमिव यज्ञे) मन्यमानाः C. B. has only पशुवत् मन्यमानाः.—P. 937. l. 11. एवं to नाहंतीति only in C. वसिष्ठं धिक्करोति B.—P. 937. l. 12. नावाजिनमिति C. अवाजिनं मूखे B.—P. 937. l. 12. अवाजिनं वाचां इमो वाजिनः सर्वज्ञः । तद्विलक्षणं मूखेजनं C.—P. 937. l. 14. तेन सह न स्पर्थत इत्यर्थः । तदा only in C.
- P. 937. l. 22. (III. 53, 24.) प्रपित्वं प्रगमनं न जानंति शिष्टैः सह C. प्रपित्वं प्रगमनं तिशिष्टैः सह B.—P. 937. l. 25. चरंति B. चारयंति Ca. व्यापयंति C.
- P. 940. l. 6. (III. 54, 4.) अद्यतनाः C. अन्यतराः B., wanting in A.
- P. 940. l. 18. (III. 54, 5.) C. has after प्राप्नोति the words केन मार्गेण देवास्तर्पयितव्या इति.
- P. 940. l. 22. (III. 54, 5.) After इत्यभिप्रायः C. adds दिव एषा पृथक्स्तुतिः.
- P. 941. l. 12. (III. 54, 6.) सहास्तां तौ च्येतां ॥ सहास्तां तौ ख्येतां Ca. सहास्तां तौ च्येतां C. सह स्तां तौ च्येतां A. सह स्तां तौ च्येतां B.
- P. 942. l. 1. (III. 54, 7.) परस्परं द्रुतः. C. has after it कस्मिन् कर्तुं प्रत्ययः.
- P. 945. l. 14. (III. 54, 13.) After द्योतमानाः C. adds द्योतमानस्य रुद्रस्य पुत्रा वा; and after मारयिताः the words मनुष्येभ्यो हिता वा.
- P. 947. l. 8. (III. 54, 16.) After चारु नाम Ca. has नासत्याविति नामरूपं च.
- P. 951. l. 14. (III. 55, 1.) After महदैश्वर्यं Ca. has बृहदेवतायामेव सूक्तं । अस्तौ द्विध्यात्मना सर्वान्मन्यमानः परं पदं । देवानामसुरत्वं तदेकं महदितीर्यन्निति.
- P. 954. l. 22. (III. 55, 8.) आसयत् MSS. आयत् Sáyaṇa.
- P. 954. l. 24. (III. 55, 8.) Ca. has at the beginning of the verse अत्र दावाग्निवादः.
- P. 957. l. 13. (III. 55, 13.) Ca. after निहितमकरोत् adds the words यद्वा कया भुवा कस्यां भुवि प्रदेशे जघःस्थानीयं मेघं निदधे । धारयति । न ज्ञायते । वर्षाकाल एव केवलं दृश्यते मेघः.
- P. 958. l. 13. (III. 55, 15.) असाधारणलिंगेनेति C. असाधारणसंगेनेति B. असाधारणसंगेनेति A.
- P. 959. l. 17. (III. 55, 17.) लोके हि A. C. यथा B.
- P. 960. l. 3. (III. 55, 18.) After शूरस्येंद्रस्य Ca. has सूर्यस्य वा.
- P. 961. l. 18. (III. 55, 21.) पुरतो निश्चयेन A. B. पुरतो इन्द्रस्य पुरतो C.
- P. 963. l. 10. (III. 56, 1.) यच्च पर्वतादीनामुन्नततयावस्थानं added from C.
- P. 963. l. 11. (III. 56, 1.) अन्यथयितुं A. B. C.
- P. 968. l. 1. (III. 57, 1.) विवेकवान् A. B. सत्यानृतविवेकवान् C.
- P. 969. l. 9. (III. 57, 3.) घेनवो A. B. नवप्रसूता गावः C.
- P. 970. l. 2. (III. 57, 4.) मनवे मनुष्यं C. मनवे अनुष्ठानं A. B.
- P. 970. l. 14. (III. 57, 5.) After प्रेष्यते C. adds यद्वा मधुमती माधुर्यवती सुमेधाः शोभनप्रज्ञानोपेता उरुची । महत् इंद्रादीनंचरति पूजयतीत्युरुची । जिह्वा वाक् देवेष्वान्नामार्थं प्रेष्यते.
- P. 972. l. 26. (III. 58, 3.) किं deest in MSS. : cf. Rv. I. 118, 3.
- P. 975. l. 3. (III. 58, 7.) After अहि तिरोहिते Ca. inserts अहि भवं अह्वं । पूर्वेष्वनुत्तरीयसवनोऽभिपुनं परेषुः प्रातःकाले.

- P. 978. l. 9. (III. 59, 3.) After वरिष्मन् Ca. adds उरुते.  
 P. 981. l. 11. (III. 60, 1.) तेषां भावो A. B. तेषां समूहो C.  
 P. 984. l. 8. (III. 60, 5.) वप्सति ॥ वभसति A. B. C.  
 P. 984. l. 15. (III. 60, 5.) भसेर्गेति ॥ भासरादेति A. B. भसेर्गेति C. गस Ca. The rule does not occur in the Unādi-sūtras.  
 P. 984. l. 24. (III. 60, 6.) After अहानि Ca. adds सौम्यानि.  
 P. 986. l. 1. (III. 61, 1.) युवतिरित्युपमा A. C. युवतिस्तरूपीत्युपमा B.  
 P. 987. l. 3. (III. 61, 3.) From मार्गः to चाविति दीर्घः the text is taken from Ca.  
 P. 987. l. 22. (III. 61, 4.) शैलुक् ॥ सा लुक् A. मोलुक् B. सोलुक् C.  
 P. 988. l. 18. (III. 61, 6.) ह्यलोकात् A. B. C. ह्यलोकादुद्वच्छंती Ca.  
 P. 989. l. 11. (III. 61, 7.) Before सर्वत्र Ca. has स्वतेजोभिः.  
 P. 990. l. 1. (III. 62, 1.) After अभिमन्यमानाः Ca. has बाध्यमानाः.  
 P. 990. l. 7. (III. 62, 1.) अन्यस्मै देवाय न तुज्याः ॥ अन्यस्मै देवाय मायं तुज्याः A. B. C. अन्यस्मै देवाय तुज्याः Ca.  
 P. 991. l. 7. (III. 62, 3.) From यद्वा हूयते to हविरिति inserted from C.  
 P. 991. l. 11. (III. 62, 3.) After पालयतु Ca. adds यद्वा होता होतुरग्नेः पत्नी भारती सूर्यपत्नी च सरस्वती च तिस्रो देव्यः पालयन्ति.  
 P. 993. l. 5. (III. 62, 9.) अत्र सकर्मकत्वात् C. अकर्मकत्वात् A. B.: cf. Pāṇ. I. 3, 29, 3.  
 P. 993. l. 8. (III. 62, 10.) The whole passage from दोषो आगात् to द्वे आ विश्वदेव omitted in A. and B.  
 P. 993. l. 15-17. (III. 62, 10.) Ca. has the following various readings: it adds सर्वासु श्रुतिषु प्रसिद्धस्य after तत्तस्य; द्योतमानस्य after देवस्य; आत्मभूतं after परमेश्वरस्य; तद्योऽहं सोऽसौ योऽसौ सोऽहमिति after धीमहि. It omits तेजः, which A. B. give after स्वयंज्योतिः.  
 P. 993. l. 22. (III. 62, 10.) From भ्येतया to धीमहि inserted from Ca. P. 993. l. 24. धीशब्दस्य कर्मपरत्वे deest in A. B.  
 P. 995. l. 1. (III. 62, 14.) After द्विपात्रः Ca. adds प्रजाभ्यः.  
 P. 996. l. 7. (III. 62, 17.) युवां दक्षस्य । दक्षं धनं बलं वा ॥ वां दक्षं धनं बलं वा A. B. युवां दक्षस्य धनं बलं वा C.

I CANNOT conclude this second volume of the Rig-veda without acknowledging my obligation for much useful advice and kind assistance which from many quarters I have continued to receive. Professor Wilson has taken the same active interest in this as in the first part, and there is not a sheet that has not received the benefit of his careful perusal. The present volume has not indeed had the advantage of Dr. Rieu's revision, to whom much of the praise bestowed on the correctness of the press in the first is due. But in the latter portion of this volume I have been able to avail myself of the assist-

ance and active cooperation of my learned friend Dr. Aufrecht of Berlin, and the benefit hence derived cannot be too highly valued. I may hope that by his continued assistance I shall be able to bring this edition to an end in a much shorter time than I at first expected. Dr. Ballantyne of Benares, Dr. Röer of Calcutta, Mr. Edward Hall of Benares, and lately Mr. Walter Elliott of Vizagapatam, have all in the most obliging manner assisted me in the execution of my work by the transmission of several most valuable MSS., without which, I fear, I should never have succeeded in accomplishing a work which I commenced without perhaps a full consciousness of all its difficulties. I have been also honoured by that distinguished scholar and noble patron of Sanskrit literature, Rāja Radhakanta Deva of Calcutta, with a most valuable present, the *Sabda Kalpa Druma*, a work which by its comprehensive range and its excellent arrangement stands unrivalled in Indian philology. At Oxford, again, I have had the advantage of the Bodleian Library, where, under the liberal management of Dr. Bandinel, scholars of all countries may avail themselves of the treasures of one of the finest collections in Europe with the same facility as if at work in their own private library.

Nor can any one, perhaps, acknowledge more thankfully than myself the valuable additions lately made to our knowledge of Vaidik literature and antiquities by the combined labours of so many distinguished scholars in India, England, France, and Germany. Many difficulties, against which I had to contend singlehanded in the first volume, have been removed by their publications. On commencing this edition I had first to copy and collate many works continually quoted by Sáyana, or otherwise essential to a full comprehension of the *Rig-veda*. There were then no editions of the other Vedas, of the *Nirukta*, the *Aitareya-bráhmaṇa*, *Áśvaláyana*, and similar works. Yet it would have been impossible to print even the first pages of Sáyana's Commentary without having to a certain extent established a critical text of these writings. Several have since been published, and their text has been settled with an accuracy greater than the limits of my time allowed me even to aim at in these supplementary treatises. Our comprehension of these works has been considerably facilitated either by translations or by notes and indices. The only works from which assistance could be derived when I commenced this edition were Rosen's first book of the *Rig-veda* and some valuable essays by Professor Nève and Dr. Kuhn. At present we have Professor Roth's edition of the *Nirukta*, Professor Benfey's *Sáma-veda*,



Dr. Weber's Yajur-veda, valuable treatises on the Grihya-sûtras by Professor Stenzler, useful indices to the Vedas by Messrs. Pertsch and Whitney, and last, not least, the first specimen of Vaidik lexicography by Roth. Many obscure points in the earliest literature of India have received new light in the first and second volumes of Lassen's classical work on Indian Antiquities. Names formerly known to few have become familiar to all through the indefatigable industry of Dr. Weber. On the whole an entirely new direction has been given to Sanskrit philology, and during the last six years the Vaidik has received greater attention than any other period of Sanskrit literature.

But since the publication of the first volume of the Rig-veda we have suffered one irreparable loss. The death of Eugène Burnouf has deprived Sanskrit philology of one of its chief supporters, of one of its greatest ornaments. His loss will be long felt in different departments of Oriental learning, where his name is associated with some of the most brilliant discoveries of our age;—nowhere longer and more keenly than among the friends and students of Sanskrit literature. Of Burnouf's works I need not here speak. As the first scientific decipherer of the Cuneiform inscriptions, he has erected to himself a monument more lasting than the mountain-records of Persia. As the first Pali scholar and the historian of Buddhism, his fame will not easily be surpassed by future researches. As the first editor and interpreter of the Zend-avesta, his memory will endure so long as the human race values the traditions of its early childhood. But Burnouf's key to all these discoveries was Sanskrit; and in Sanskrit philology, where his influence was most beneficial, his loss is now felt most severely. I do not here allude to the Bhagavat-purâna and other monuments of his persevering industry now left unfinished, nor to the works he contemplated, nor to the treasures he had collected. In losing Burnouf, we have lost not only an indefatigable fellow-labourer, not only a disinterested teacher, but a most respected judge; in his approval valued by all, in his censure feared, in his verdict distinguished unfailingly by fairness and by truth. Though he published but little on the Veda, yet I may safely assert—and those with whom I had the benefit of attending his lectures at the Collège de France, Barthélemy St. Hilaire, Gorresio, Nève, Pavie, Foucaux, Roth, Goldstücker, Bardelli, and many others, will bear me out—that there was not then a scholar in Europe more conversant with the language and the traditions of the Veda than Burnouf. The intimate friend of Rosen, he alone kept up after Rosen's death

the tradition of Vaidik studies. He impressed their importance on all who came to study under him, and he proved that for a true appreciation of the early history of mankind, and for a comparative study of the religions of the East, a knowledge of the Veda was indispensable. The new impulse given to Sanskrit philology in that direction, and the subsequent publication of numerous Vaidik works, were due to him; and for my own part I can only repeat, that without Burnouf's advice, encouragement, and assistance, I should never have been able to undertake this edition of the Rig-veda. When I heard of his death I felt—and I believe that many engaged in similar studies shared the feeling—as if our work had lost much of its charm and its purpose. ‘What will Burnouf say?’ was my earliest thought, on completing the first volume of the Rig-veda. And now as I am finishing the second, in its turn submitted to the judgment of so many scholars whose friendship I value, and whose learning I admire, my thoughts turn again to him who is no longer among us, and I think, not without sadness, of what his judgment would have been.

M. M.

SIR ROBERT TAYLOR'S INSTITUTION, OXFORD,  
*Christmas 1853.*





# P R E F A C E.

---

IN laying before the public the third volume of my edition of the Rig-veda and its Commentary by Sáyana Áchárya, it gives me much pleasure to acknowledge the increasing interest which of late years has been evinced by the most eminent scholars in England, in India, and on the continent, with regard to these ancient remnants of the sacred poetry of the Brahmans. Their importance for Sanskrit literature had been felt ever since Sir William Jones, Colebrooke, and F. Rosen informed us of their existence, and gave us the first specimens of their contents; and no one acquainted with the later literature of India, the epic poems, the law-books, the systems of philosophy, could fail to see that our knowledge of the historical growth of the Indian mind must remain incomplete until we had gained an insight into that period of literature which precedes Vyása and Valmíki, Manu and Jaimini, and to which the poets, the lawgivers, and philosophers of India point with common consent as the highest authority for their inspirations, their belief, and their institutions. Sanskrit literature without the Veda was like Greek literature without Homer, like Arabic literature without the Koran, like English without Shakespear.

But as the study of Sanskrit owes its permanent interest chiefly to the fact that the ancient language of India has been proved to be most intimately connected with the classical languages of Europe, and that in it has been found the key to the most secret archives of the history of language in general, the Veda would never have engaged the serious attention of a large class of scholars, if this ancient literary relic had not been found to shed the most unexpected light on the darkest periods in the history of the most prominent nations of antiquity. The religious traditions of the Persians or the Zoroastrians have been traced back to their source in the *Veda*. Many of the most obscure grammatical forms in the arrow-headed inscriptions of Darius and Xerxes have

been deciphered by means of the *Veda*. The mythology of Greece and Italy, nay of Germany and Iceland, has suddenly assumed a new aspect and an intelligible expression by being confronted with the poetical language of the *Veda*. Even civil institutions, local customs, and proverbial expressions, which we meet with in the later history of the Arian nations, have received an unexpected explanation in the simple poetry of the *Veda*. In this manner the *Veda*, though not yet known in its completeness, has assumed an importance which no other literary production of India could ever have claimed; and we may rest convinced, that as long as man cherishes the records of his family, in the widest sense of the word, these simple songs will maintain their place among the most valued annals of ancient history. There is one class of readers that may have been disappointed—men who study ancient literature less on account of its historical than its poetical value. Those who expected in the *Veda*, strains like the elaborate odes of Pindar, or the vague and misty exhalations of Ossian, will have found but very little answering their expectations. But the true historian values facts, ancient and genuine; and a corroded copper As of the Roman republic is of greater value to him than an imperial gold medal of the most exquisite workmanship. What Schelling says with regard to the deities of the later Hindu pantheon, such as they are represented to us in the Mahábhárata, the poems of Kalidása, and the Puráṇas, applies to all facts of history: “Hideous or not, they stand before us, and so require a rational explanation\*.”

But it has been a still greater pleasure to me, while engaged for so many years in preparing a critical edition, not only of the text of the Rig-veda, but also of its Commentary by Sáyana Áchárya, to observe how the conviction seems to be growing more and more general, that without this Commentary an accurate and scholarlike knowledge of the *Veda* could never have been obtained. There was at first much controversy as to the value of Sáyana, and as to the necessity of an edition, and particularly of a critical edition, of his Commentary. Now it seemed to me, that his strong and his weak points must have been so apparent to all who entered honestly into the study of Sáyana, that I hardly thought it incumbent on me to defend him against his enemies, or to save him from his friends. For though we all admired the quick perception and the brilliant divination displayed by some distinguished scholars in their attempts to guess the meaning of these ancient hymns without the help of that tradition which

\* Schelling's Philosophy of Mythology, p. 24.

Sáyana embodied in his Commentary—and though a work like that of the late M. Langlois, who actually published a complete translation of the Veda at a time when most scholars were content with deciphering a few lines, will always excite our admiration by the boldness, the perseverance, and the undoubted ingenuity which it displays—yet before the tribunal of a more severe scholarship such works could not be approved; and it begins to be recognised that the errors which they propagated have proved so mischievous as to outweigh the many right guesses which no doubt they contained.

It would have been equally wrong, however, to consider Sáyana's Commentary as an infallible authority with regard to the interpretation of the Veda. Sáyana gives the traditional, but not the original, sense of the Vaidik hymns. These hymns—originally popular songs, short prayers and thanksgivings, sometimes true, genuine, and even sublime, but frequently childish, vulgar, and obscure—were invested by the Brahmans with the character of an inspired revelation, and made the basis of a complete system of dogmatic theology. If therefore we wish to know how the Brahmans, from the time of the composition of the first Bráhmana to the present day, understood and interpreted the hymns of their ancient Rishis, we ought to translate them in strict accordance with Sáyana's gloss. This is the object which Professor Wilson has always kept in view in his translation of the Veda; and for the history of religion, which in India, as elsewhere, represents the gradual corruption of simple truth into hierarchical dogmatism and philosophical hallucination, his work will always remain the most trustworthy guide. Nor could it be said, that the tradition of the Brahmans, which Sáyana embodied in his work, after the lapse of at least three thousand years, had changed the character of the whole of the Rig-veda. By far the greater part of these hymns is so simple and straightforward, that there can be no doubt that their original meaning was exactly the same as their traditional interpretation. But no religion, no poetry, no law, no language, can resist the wear and tear of thirty centuries; and in the Veda, as in other works, handed down to us from a very remote antiquity, the sharp edges of primitive thought, the delicate features of a young language, the fresh hue of unconscious poetry, have been washed away by the successive waves of what we call *tradition*, whether we look upon it as a principle of growth or decay. To restore the primitive outlines of the Vaidik period of thought will be a work of great

difficulty. \* “ We may collect all the passages where an obscure word occurs, we may compare them and look for a meaning which would be appropriate to all; but the difficulty lies in finding a sense which we can appropriate and transfer by analogy into our own language and thought. We must be able to translate our feelings and ideas into their language at the same time that we translate their poems and prayers into our own. We must not despair even where their words seem meaningless and their ideas barren or wild. What seems at first childish may at a happier moment disclose a sublime simplicity, and even in helpless expressions we may recognise aspirations after some high and noble idea. When the scholar has done his work, the poet and philosopher must take it up and finish it. Let the scholar collect, collate, sift, and reject—let him say what is possible or not according to the laws of the Vaidik language—let him study the commentaries, the Sūtras, the Bráhmaṇas, and even later works, in order to exhaust all the sources from which information can be derived. He must not despise the tradition of the Brahmins, even where their misconceptions and the causes of their misconceptions are palpable. To know what a passage cannot mean is frequently the key to its real meaning; and whatever reasons may be pleaded for declining a careful perusal of the traditional interpretations of Yáska or Sáyana, they can all be traced back to an ill-concealed ‘argumentum paupertatis.’ Not a corner in the Bráhmaṇas, the Sūtras, Yáska, and Sáyana should be left unexplored before we venture to propose a rendering of our own. Sáyana, though the most modern, is on the whole the most sober interpreter. Most of his etymological absurdities must be placed to Yáska’s account, and the optional renderings which he allows for metaphysical, theological, or ceremonial purposes, are mostly due to his regard for the Bráhmaṇas. These Bráhmaṇas, though nearest in time to the hymns of the Rig-veda, indulge in the most frivolous and ill-judged interpretations. When the ancient Rishi exclaims with a troubled heart, ‘Who is the greatest of the gods? Who shall first be praised by our songs?’—the author of the Bráhmaṇa sees in the interrogative pronoun ‘Who’ some divine name, a place is allotted in the sacrificial invocations to a god ‘Who,’ and hymns addressed to him are called ‘Whoish’ hymns. To make such misunderstandings possible, we must assume a considerable interval between the composition of the hymns and the Bráhmaṇas. As the authors of the Bráhmaṇas were blinded by theology, the

\* See the Author’s Essay on the Veda and Zendavesta, page 13.

authors of the still later Niruktas were deceived by etymological fictions, and both conspired to mislead by their authority later and more sensible commentators, such as Sáyana. Where Sáyana has no authority to mislead him, his Commentary is at all events rational; but still his scholastic notions would never allow him to accept the free interpretation which a comparative study of these venerable documents forces upon the unprejudiced scholar. We must therefore discover ourselves the real vestiges of these ancient poets; and if we follow them cautiously, we shall find that with some effort we are still able to walk in their footsteps. We shall feel that we are brought face to face and mind to mind with men yet intelligible to us, after we have freed ourselves from our modern conceits. We shall not succeed always: words, verses, nay, whole hymns in the Rig-veda, will and must remain to us a dead letter. But where we can inspire those early relics of thought and devotion with new life, we shall have before us more real antiquity than in all the inscriptions of Egypt or Nineveh; not only old names and dates, and kingdoms and battles, but old thoughts, old hopes, old faith, and old errors, the old 'Man' altogether—old now, but then young and fresh, and simple and real in his prayers and in his praises."

How the Veda should be interpreted, and how Sáyana's Commentary should be made use of for that purpose, has lately been shown in a work by M. Ad. Regnier, "*Étude sur l'idiome des Védas et les origines de la Langue Sanscrite, Première Partie*, Paris 1855." I may be allowed to quote from this excellent essay the following passage, which lays down with fairness and exactness the principles which ought to be followed by every student of the Veda. "Je joins au texte des hymnes celui du commentaire de Sáyana Áchárya, que je suivrai, dans son interprétation, partout où il me semblera que la logique et la grammaire le permettent; toutes les fois que j'adopterai un autre avis que le sien, j'en donnerai les raisons: d'abord pour bien établir le sens, parce que, dans une matière souvent aussi obscure, il faut toujours savoir d'abord l'avis des Indiens eux-mêmes; puis, parce que ces scolies nous donneront l'occasion de faire connaissance avec quelques-unes des habitudes les plus ordinaires d'interprétation des glossateurs. Tous ceux qui ont eu le bonheur de suivre le cours de M. Eugène Burnouf savent quelle importance il attachait à l'explication des commentaires. Le meilleur moyen, selon lui, d'assurer et de hâter les progrès et de se rompre aux difficultés de la langue, c'était de se familiariser de bonne



heure avec la méthode et le style des grammairiens, style souvent très-abstrait et où les procédés d'expression synthétique sont poussés fréquemment à l'excès."

Even if the author had not paid this tribute to the memory of E. Burnouf, the accuracy and painstaking minuteness of his work would have shown that he belonged to Burnouf's school; and it is pleasing to see how the spirit of that eminent scholar seems still to be alive in that brilliant senate of learning of which he once formed so illustrious a member, when we read that the French Academy has proposed as one of its last prizes—

"Un commentaire particulièrement exégétique et grammatical, soit sur une partie suivie, soit sur un choix d'hymnes du Rig-véda, où l'on aura soin d'exposer toujours et de discuter, s'il y a lieu, même quand on ne l'adoptera pas, l'opinion du commentateur Sáyana Áchárya."

Such a prize, while it gives a sanction to my work, for which I cannot sufficiently express my gratitude, will, it is to be hoped, act as an encouragement, and bring some of our young Sanskrit scholars toward that line of study which Burnouf pointed out to all of his pupils, as the most sure to lead to real and lasting results.

After what has been stated in the prefaces to the first and second volumes, I have little to add with regard to the MSS. which I used for the third volume. There is one notice which I lately received from the Rev. Dr. Stevenson, the distinguished editor and translator of the Sáma-veda, and which I subjoin here in confirmation of my views on the local origin of the three families of the MSS. of Sáyana's Commentary.

"As I see you have formed a particular family of the two MSS. B 1. and B 2, I may as well mention to you all I have learnt of their history. B 1. was procured at Puna from a Wakil, who procured it from the family of the Guru of the late Peshwah; at least, so he said; and, as the family was poor, and no one else likely to have such a work, there is no reason to discredit his story. It is, as you will see, written by two different scribes, the greater part in what we at Bombay call Káyasthi lipi, the handwriting of Káyasths from the province of Guzerat. The letters in this portion are very deep. The rest is written by a Deccaní Brahman in what we call the Dakshaní lipi, and not so deep as the other. This difference is discernible even in the Cave inscriptions in the old character.

"B 2. was copied for M. Burnouf from that MS. by a Puna Brahman, whom I got to transcribe it for him.

“I have also an imperfect copy of another MS. of the Bháshya. The whole of the 7th Ashtaka is wanting, and I have only two Adhyáyas of the 8th. If you would like to see them, I shall be happy to send them; and indeed the whole MS. is at your service. There is a complete copy of the Bháshya of the Rig-veda Sanhita in the library of the R. A. Society, Bombay branch. The first Ashtaka is copied from B 1, and would be of no use to you; but the rest was taken, I am told, at Mr. Elphinstone's expense, or at that of the Bombay government, and deposited in the library, from a copy belonging to Dr. Taylor, which was carried to England, as I understood, to be deposited in the library of the India-House. As, however, you take no notice of such a work there\*, I must have been under a mistake about that. However, there is no mistake about Dr. Taylor's having had such a work, and the Bombay copy having been taken, sometime about 1820, from it, with the exception of the first Ashtaka, which was omitted, why I cannot say. The imperfect copy I have is partly taken from this, and partly made up of portions of a MS. received from the Wakil.”

Another communication on the MSS. of Sáyana's Commentary was kindly sent to me by my learned friend Mr. Fitz-Edward Hall, while yet at Benares. I had applied to him for help with regard to some extremely difficult passages in the fifth Ashtaka, and in the hope that some more fragments of the MS. mentioned in my preface to the second volume, p. xii, might still be discovered in India. He wrote to me, Benares, Jan. 15, 1855:

“I was much afraid that I should have to send off this letter without being able to furnish you with the means of perhaps supplying the lacunæ you have encountered in the fifth Ashtaka. In fact, but a few hours have elapsed since I was able to put together the extracts from MS.  $\beta$ , which I enclose. We have in the College library but one MS. of Sáyana's Commentary on the R. V. It was copied in the Samvat year 1851, and is, as you will see under the heading of MS.  $\alpha$ , of little value. Notwithstanding repeated enquiries, I was unable to get sight of any other MS. until  $\beta$ . was brought to me yesterday. This MS. is without date of transcription, and has no external indications of any antiquity. I think the passages from it, which I now send, fully justify me in ordering a

\* Dr. Taylor's copy was not mentioned in the preface to the first volume, because it only begins with the third Ashtaka. It will be seen from my preface to the second volume, which Dr. Stevenson had not received, that I recognised this MS. as

one of the B. class, though, particularly in the later books, it has peculiar readings, and is sometimes evidently an abbreviation of the original text of the B. MSS.

copy to be made forthwith of the whole of the fifth Ashtaka\*. If you request it, I will have the remainder of the MS. copied; but, as there is a possibility that its character will differ in different Ogdoads, you had better send some test-passages by which to decide its value in the subsequent Ashtakas.

“As for the sheet which I send you, it has reference to the last passage or passages noted in the paper you sent. I was not sure what it was you required. Accordingly, if I have erred, it has been on the right side. The first copy was made from  $\alpha$ , which I afterwards changed by interlineations and erasures to correspond to  $\beta$ . I shall be happy if I hear that I have been the instrument of rescuing your work from even a single imperfection.

“Are you acquainted with an abridgment of Sáyana's Commentary by Mudgala? The grammatical explanations are omitted altogether, and the remainder of the comment so abridged that the whole takes up about a fourth part the space of the original. Our copy professes to be taken in the Samvat year 147-. The last figure is unsupplied. Strange to say, it does not break off in the fourth Adhyáya of the first Ashtaka, where all your MSS. of the A. and B. classes terminate; but it runs on to the words *मित्रमहर्ष*, p. 538, l. 5. Afterwards there occurs the same appearance of supplial by a later hand, to which you call attention; a peculiarity which I observed also in the MS.  $\beta$ . If this epitome may be trusted, the mutilated passage at the bottom of page 969 should run thus: युवं युवां यत्किंचनास्तम् निरतंसतम् । †.

\* This copy has since been received. It begins with the third Adhyáya of the fifth Ashtaka.

† This MS. has since been sent to the library of the East-India-House. It contains Ashtaka I, II, and III, and the last three Adhyáyas of Ashtaka IV. Some fragments of the first and seventh Ashtakas were presented to me by Mr. Fitz-Edward Hall. I subjoin the beginning of the first Ashtaka so far as it is legible, and without attempting to correct all mistakes:

श्रीगणेशाय नमः ।

ओं सच्चिदानन्दभूपाय नित्याय विमलाय च ।

प्रत्यक्षैतनरूपाय जगद्रूपायते नमः ॥

गणेशाय नमस्तुभ्यं निर्विघ्नकराय च ।

सरस्वत्यै नमस्तुभ्यं ज्ञानबोधे स्थिरा भव ॥

आलोच्य पूर्वभाष्यं च बह्वचस्य संमतः (समततः?) ।

गहनं मन्यमानेन सुबोधेन समुद्धृतं ॥

नवनीतं यथा क्षीरात्सिक्तायाश्च कांचनं ।

तथा समुद्धृतं सारं प्राणिनां बोधसिद्धये ॥

मौढ्यल्यगोत्रेण च मुद्गलेन ह्यात्मानुभूतेन सुसंस्कृतेन ।

यथापिभूतेन सुसाधकेन समुद्धृतं सारमिमं वरिष्ठं ॥

वेदार्थहीनस्य भारवाहकत्वं वेदांगे निरुक्ते उक्तं । स्थाणु-  
र्यं न विज्ञां योऽर्थज्ञं वेदमधीत्य वेदार्थो ज्ञातव्यः ।

तदुक्तं श्रौतस्मार्चकर्म कर्तव्यं फलत्यागकृतेन स्वशास्त्रोक्तकर्मणा  
चित्रशुद्धिर्भविष्यति । चित्रशुद्ध्या ह्यात्मज्ञानं भविष्यति ।

तस्मात्कारणाद्वेदार्थज्ञानमवश्यं साधितव्यं ॥ ऋग्वेदस्याश्व-  
लायनी सांख्यायनी शाकला बाष्कला मांडूका चेति पंच

शाखाः । तत्र शाकलसंहितायां दश मंडलानि । तत्र प्रथमे  
मंडले चतुर्विंशानुवाकाः । तत्र प्रथमानुवाके त्रीणि सूक्तानि ।

देवताछंदशीणां सम्यग्बोधाय प्रकाशितानि । तत्र अग्नि-  
मील इति नवर्चं प्रथमं सूक्तं । विश्वामित्रपुत्रो मधुच्छंदनामक

ऋषिः । गायत्रं आग्नेयं ॥ ओं नमः श्रीगणपतये ॥ ओं

“ Did you ever hear of a Rig-bhāshya by Rāvaṇa? Sūrya Paṇḍit, in his Paramārtha-prabhā, a commentary on the Bhagavadgīta, professes to have seen it. I am also told, that a commentary by Rāvaṇa on one of the Śākhās of the Yajur-veda is still extant.

“ I have failed entirely in all attempts to trace the history of the MS. of Sāyana, of which I sent you some fragments. But I have since procured a fragment of the eighth Ashtaka, very like it in outward appearance.”

In another letter, dated Ajmere, 24th May, 1856, the same distinguished scholar wrote to me :

“ It must be perplexing to be obliged to illuminate Sāyana's text with stars. I am not going to say that the publication of this work was undertaken prematurely : but I am pretty well assured, from what I have observed, that there still lie hidden, in the libraries of rigid Brahmans, scores of hereditary copies of this Commentary; and it is scarcely unreasonable to suppose that, if procurable, they might supply your lacunæ.”

There is one more MS. which ought to be mentioned here. It belongs to the library of the East-India-House (No. 2612), and bears the title ऋग्वेदभाष्यपट्टाष्टकसंपूर्ण. It is, however, not the sixth, but the fifth Ashtaka of the Rig-veda. As it bears the date संवत् १६६३, it might have been expected to yield some help towards the restoration of Sāyana's text; but on closer inspection it turned out an exact and literal reproduction of my own MS. Ca.

When I began this edition, I thought the whole of it would be completed in three or four volumes, and I now find that the first three volumes contain hardly more than half of the whole work. I must confess that I could have wished that the ancient poets of the Veda and their Indian commentators had been less diffuse; for though I believe that no edition of any author in Sanskrit or any other language, for which manuscripts had first to be copied, others to be collated, innumerable references to be verified, and an index to be made of every word, has ever been brought out so rapidly as this edition of the Rig-veda, yet I feel that ten years of my life are gone, and I know not whether I shall have sufficient time left to finish a work which I once undertook perhaps with too

अग्निमीलु इति । अग्निं देवं ईले स्तौमि । कीदृशमग्निं । अन्विजं । देवानां यज्ञेषु होतृनामकं अन्विक् अग्निरेव । पुनः यज्ञस्य पुरोहितं यज्ञस्य संबंधिनि पूर्वभागे आहवनीयरूपे- कीदृशं । रत्नाधारं । यागफलरूपाणां रत्नानामतिशयेन शावस्थितं । पुनः कीदृशं । देवं । दानादिगुणयुक्तं होतारं धारयितारं ॥

much confidence. Yet even if I should not see the completion of this work, I should not be sorry for the time that I have spent on it; and nothing will ever induce me to change the principles which I have hitherto followed, and to give a hasty copy of a MS., instead of a critical edition of the text and commentary of the Rig-veda. I have had again for this volume the valuable assistance of my learned friend Dr. Aufrecht, and I sincerely regret that I shall no longer enjoy this advantage, as much of the correctness and accuracy of the last volumes was due to his conscientious cooperation, joined to the kind assistance which I have never failed to receive from my honoured friend Professor H. H. Wilson.

I have to express my deep obligation to the Court of Directors of the Honourable the East-India-Company, under the chairmanship of Colonel Sykes, and to the Board of Control, under the presidency of the Right Honourable Vernon Smith, for having sanctioned the continuation of this work, and granted funds necessary for its completion—an act of enlightened liberality, which will be applauded by all persons interested in the history of India and in the history of mankind, and by which one of the most important monuments of antiquity will be rescued from oblivion and restored in its integrity.

M. M.

OXFORD, June 5, 1856.

# P R E F A C E.

SINCE the publication of the third volume of this edition of the Rig-veda, the age and authenticity of the sacred writings of the Brahmans have become the subject of new and animated discussions, and many points in the history of the ancient literature of India which seemed almost beyond the reach of reasonable criticism, have become overcast by doubts and surmises. Although it would be impossible to examine every objection that has been raised, there are some which deserve a careful consideration; and I feel that it becomes part of the duty incumbent on me, as the editor of the Rig-veda, to state how far the convictions which I expressed on former occasions as to the age and character of the Vedic literature in its four divisions, the Chhandas, Mantra, Bráhmaṇa, and Sūtra periods, have been either changed or strengthened by the researches and arguments of other scholars.

The first question which requires to be considered anew is,

*Can the age of the Vedic hymns be fixed by astronomical evidence?*

In my "History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature" I have endeavoured to show that it is possible to distinguish four great classes of literary compositions, corresponding to four great periods in the growth of the Vedic religion and of the theological system of the Brahmans. The most recent of these four periods extends to about 200 B. C., and from the peculiar style in which all the works belonging to it are composed, it has received the name of the *Sūtra period*. Several of the most eminent among the authors of Sūtras or aphorisms lived prior, if not to the origin, at least to the spreading and the political ascendancy of Buddhism, and hence the date 600 B. C. was assigned as the most probable for the beginning of the Sūtra period.

It is, I believe, admitted by all scholars, that the Sūtras presuppose the existence of the Bráhmaṇas, another class of Vedic writings, which together

constitute what I call the *Bráhmaṇa period*. As that period comprehends the first establishment of the elaborate Brahmanical ceremonial with its four classes of priests, the composition of separate theological treatises, the so-called Bráhmaṇas\*, their collection, and again the schism of sects which were founded originally on the basis of the great collective Bráhmaṇas, it would seem impossible to bring the whole of this literary and theological activity within a narrower space than 200 years. I therefore assigned to it a duration from 800 to 600 B. C.

The Bráhmaṇas, again, presuppose the existence of a complete collection of Vedic hymns, such as we now possess in the ten books of the Rig-veda Sanhitá. Seven out of these ten books belonged originally to separate families or clans, and each contains a number of hymns, clearly the productions of different generations of poets. Some of these hymns are written in imitation of others, and the more modern assume a decidedly ritual character. As Mantra is the technical name of a hymn employed for sacrificial purposes, I have designated the period during which the latest sacrificial hymns were written, and collected, together with the older hymns, at first into separate books, and afterwards into a complete body of sacred and liturgical poetry, the *Mantra period*. Several generations of modern poets, and probably two classes of collectors, have to be accommodated in it; so that if we allow 200 years to this period, this is hardly out of proportion to the work which had to be performed in it.

\* I differ from Professor Westergaard (Abhandlungen, p. 57), and still prefer to derive bráhmaṇa from brahmán, 'the priest,' not from bráhman, which is said to have the sense of "the holy element in the sacrifice." (Roth, Nirukta, p. XXVI.) My reasons are,

1. It is not correct to form a derivative like bráhmaṇa from a neuter, bráhman, in the sense of treating of or concerned with the bráhman. We should not find a work, treating of náman or sáman, called námāna or sāmāna; at least I know of no analogous formation in classical Sanskrit. It would certainly be against Pāṇini, for Pāṇini allows the suffix añ only after words which have not the udátta on the first syllable. (IV. 2, 44.) He would allow bráhmaṇa to be formed from brahmán, 'priest,' but not from bráhman, 'prayer.'

2. Bráhmaṇ does not occur, at least in ancient works, in the sense of "the holy element in the sacrifice;" it means 'prayers,' 'offerings.' In later works it is used for Veda or holy word, &c.

3. The Bráhmaṇas treat chiefly of the outward ceremonial, the karman. They give the vidhis, 'rules,' or the kalpa, 'ceremonial,' together with the arthavādas, 'comments.' The bráhman is treated of in the Aranyakas and Upanishads, which constitute the brahmakāṇḍa, as opposed to the karmakāṇḍa.

4. The Bráhmaṇas contain just that kind of information which the Brahmáns, as overseers at sacrifices, would want, nay, without which they could hardly have exercised that ministerial function which was peculiarly their own.

There remains the last and most important period in the history of Vedic literature, that of the ancient poets or Rishis, who, by their songs, gave the first impulse to the religion, the poetry, the worship of the Aryan dwellers in India. Their forefathers were strangers in the land of the Seven Rivers, and some of the thoughts and accents of the earliest Vedic hymns may point beyond the natural frontiers of the great Indian peninsula. To assign any definite date to the first or the last of the old Rishis is clearly impossible; yet looking at the numerous relics of that early age, I ventured to suggest 200 years as a minimum, which few, acquainted with the early history of mankind, could consider extravagant. I thus arrived at about 1200 B.C. as the latest date at which we may suppose the Vedic bards settled in the Northern regions of the Indian continent. I pointed out repeatedly, that beyond the frontiers of the Sūtra period (600—200 B.C.) our chronological measurements must necessarily be of a merely hypothetical character; yet I felt convinced that those who from an intimate acquaintance with the Vedic literature are most competent to form an opinion as to the time required for its growth, its maturity, and its decay, would allow that the minimum durations assigned by me to the Bráhmaṇa, Mantra, and Chhandas periods were below rather than above the average durations of similar periods in the intellectual and literary history of other nations. I may be allowed to quote the concluding words of my History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, as I find they have given rise to a curious misunderstanding. “The chronological limits,” I said, “assigned to the Sūtra and Bráhmaṇa periods will seem to most Sanskrit scholars too narrow rather than too wide, and if we assign but 200 years to the Mantra period, from 800 to 1000 B.C., and an equal number to the Chhandas period, from 1000 to 1200 B.C., we can do so only under the supposition that, during the early periods of history, the growth of the human mind was more luxuriant than in later times, and that the layers of thought were formed less slowly in the primary than in the tertiary ages of the world.”

I should have thought that the meaning of this paragraph could hardly have been misapprehended, and that the expression “layers of thought,” was sufficient to show that the terms “primary and tertiary ages of the world,” could not refer to geological periods and to the growth of the crust of the earth, but were used metaphorically of the periods in the historical growth



of the human mind. I was not prepared therefore for a question addressed to me rather bluntly by a distinguished philosopher. "Is 1200 B.C. a primary age of the world except in Biblical geology?"—a question to my mind entirely meaningless, unless we ascribe to it a meaning unworthy of so intelligent and liberal-minded a writer.

With this single exception, however, my anticipations of the judgment of all competent scholars with regard to the minimum durations assigned by me to the four periods of Vedic literature have not been deceived. On a question so purely hypothetical as the chronological system on which my History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature was built, the assenting votes of independent and fair-minded scholars are, of course, of great importance, and I shall therefore quote the opinions of some who have a right to be heard on these difficult problems. Professor Wilson, in his Review of my History\*, says:

"Professor Müller thinks it impossible to assign a shorter interval than two centuries for the origin and accumulation of the mass of Brahmanical literature that must have existed. We confess that we are disposed to look upon this limit as much too brief for the establishment of an elaborate ritual, for the appropriation of all spiritual authority by the Brahmans, for the distinction of races or the institution of caste, and for the mysticism and speculation of the Āranyakas or Upanishads: a period of five centuries would not seem to be too protracted for such a complete remodelling of the primitive system and its wide dissemination through all those parts of India where the Brahmans have spread. There seems no reason to question the general accuracy of the lists of teachers preserved by Brahmanical tradition, and which, as Professor Müller remarks, would extend the limits of this age to a very considerable degree. These traditions are preserved in different supplementary works or Vansās, also regarded as Brāhmaṇas, several of which are extant. There are several of these in the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa, which Professor Müller quotes, and he concludes that from their extent it is possible that the limit he suggests will have to be extended. We quite concur in this anticipation, and think there can be little doubt that, instead of two centuries, we may venture to conjecture four or five, and so carry the commencement of the Brāhmaṇa period to the tenth or eleventh century B.C."

\* Edinburgh Review, 1860, p. 375.

The same scholar, after stating his reasons for treating the Mantra and Chhandas periods as one "complete in itself, though extending over a long space of time, and in some instances to a very remote antiquity," hints at the twelfth to the twentieth centuries B. C. as the probable limits of the age which gave birth to the poetry of the Veda.

M. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire\*, in his articles on the same work (January, p. 53), has the following remarks as to the approximative durations assigned by me to the four periods of Vedic literature: "Ces considérations n'amènent naturellement à la dernière question que je voulais traiter, en rendant compte de l'ouvrage de M. Max Müller, et que j'ai déjà plus d'une fois indiquée; c'est celle de la chronologie. L'auteur ne pouvait guère se borner à diviser l'histoire de l'ancienne littérature Sanscrite dans les quatre périodes distinctes que nous avons successivement parcourues avec lui; il devait aussi tenter d'assigner à chacune de ces périodes une durée approximative. Mais c'est là qu'est le péril, quand on songe à quelles incertitudes est encore livré presque toute la chronologie indienne, et de quelles ténèbres elle est couverte. Cependant, en s'appuyant sur quelques données générales, qui sont actuellement admises par les indianistes, et dont j'ai parlé plus haut, M. Max Müller établit que les quatre périodes répondent aux dates suivantes; la période des Sôûtras, qui dure quatre siècles s'étend en remontant de l'an 200 avant J. C. à l'an 600; celle des Brâhmanas comprend de l'an 600 à l'an 800; celle des Mantras, de l'an 800 à l'an 1000; et enfin la période du Tchhandas va de l'an 1000 à l'an 1200 avant l'ère chrétienne. Il est bien entendu que ce ne sont là que des à peu près, et, malgré l'apparente rigueur de ces chiffres, il est clair qu'on ne peut arriver en ceci à aucune détermination précise. Aussi M. Max Müller aurait-il peut-être bien fait de ne pas chercher à fixer des limites aussi arrêtées et de ne pas circonscrire si nettement les choses. Comme il y a nécessairement toujours beaucoup de vague dans les appréciations de ce genre, il est bon que la forme donnée à des hypothèses soit indécise elle-même autant que les assertions; et, comme il n'y a rien de moins flexible qu'un nombre une fois qu'il est énoncé, il eût mieux valu, je crois, rester dans une demi-obscurité, qui est, d'ailleurs, bien excusable en ces matières. Tout le monde reconnaîtra, du reste, que les supputations de M. Max Müller sont très-modérées, et, s'il a failli en quelque chose, c'est plutôt par un excès de réserve. La durée de chacune de ces périodes est bien courte; et, comme les

\* Journal des Savants, August, September, October, December, 1860, and January 1861.

Samhitás, telles que nous les possédons, sont rédigées un millier d'années au moins avant notre ère, on peut faire remonter sans la moindre crainte la période du Tchhandas fort au delà, et l'on en revient ainsi aux calculs de Sir William Jones et de Colebrooke, qui reportaient la composition du Rig-Véda à quatorze ou quinze cents ans avant J. C.

“D'un autre côté, cette durée uniforme de deux siècles donnée à la période des Bráhmanas, comme à celle des Mantras et du Tchhandas peut également prêter à la critique. Si la période des Soûtras a pu remplir quatre siècles entiers, il paraît peu probable que celle des Bráhmanas, qui sont beaucoup plus longs et tout aussi nombreux peut-être, n'en ait pas rempli davantage, en y comprenant les Áraṇyakas et les Oupanishads. Il y a certainement aussi beaucoup moins de distance entre les Bráhmanas et les Soûtras, qu'il n'y en a entre les Mantras et les Bráhmanas. Cependant M. Max Müller ne compte que deux siècles entre chacune de ces deux classes. L'analogie semblerait autoriser à mettre bien plus d'intervalle entre les unes qu'entre les autres. Il y a une immense différence entre l'époque où l'on constitue les recueils de la poésie sacrée et l'époque où on les commente; il y en a moins entre cette dernière et celle où l'on réduit ces commentaires diffus et obscurs à des règles claires et méthodiques. Quant à la période des Mantras, elle semble, de son côté, trop développée, si celle des Bráhmanas ne l'est point assez. En admettant qu'il ait fallu deux siècles pour la composition des Bráhmanas, la simple collection des Samhitás n'a pas dû en exiger autant. Ainsi donc, sans contester la durée absolue des périodes réunies, leur durée relative ne paraît pas très-acceptable, et cette proportion pourrait être établie d'une manière toute différente, qui se justifierait non moins bien. Quant à la période du Tchhandas, la première de toutes, et la plus féconde puisqu'elle a enfanté tout le reste, il est bien à présumer qu'elle a été la plus longue; et cette inspiration, qui a vivifié, durant plus de trois mille ans, toute la croyance religieuse d'un grand peuple, n'a pas pu être passagère pour que ses effets aient été si durables. Mais je quitte le champ des conjectures, et je m'empresse de résumer cette analyse que j'ai faite avec tant de détails, et tant de satisfaction du livre de M. Max Müller.”

Like Professor Wilson and M. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, Professor Whitney too, the learned editor of the Atharva-veda and of the Súrya-siddhánta, has expressed his conviction that the chronological limits assigned by me to the four periods of Vedic literature are too narrow rather than too wide.

“We may next follow Professor Müller,” he writes, “in his attempt to establish a chronological groundwork for the Vedic literature. How extremely delicate and difficult a task this is wont to be in matters affecting the literary history of India, is sufficiently known to all who have had any occasion to deal with the subject. What wild and baseless theories respecting the dates of events, and the periods of works, or classes of works, in Hindu antiquity, have been built up and accepted, only to be overthrown again and forgotten! But also what learned and cautious conclusions upon like subjects have been drawn by critical scholars, to be proved fallacious and set aside by farther research! It can scarcely be said that there is a single Sanskrit work, not of quite modern authorship, in existence, whatever be its prominence and importance, over the period of which there reigns not an uncertainty to be measured only by centuries. The one reliable date which we possess for Indian history, until times long posterior to the Christian era, is furnished by the Greek accounts of the Indian sovereign ‘Sandrocottus,’ contemporary of the early successors of Alexander. That this is the king called by the Hindus Chandragupta, the founder of a new dynasty upon the Ganges, there can be no reasonable doubt; luckily, the prominence of his grandson, Aśoka, in Buddhist history, as the Constantine of Buddhism, the first who gave that religion supremacy in India, has led to the preservation of such trustworthy accounts of him as permit the satisfactory identification of the two personages. This datum is well styled by our author the sheet-anchor of Indian chronology; without it we should be, even respecting the most important eras of Indian history, drifting almost hopelessly at sea. If there has been, besides this, any date in which nearly all students of Hindu archaeology have acquiesced, agreeing to regard it as satisfactorily established, it has been that of the death of Buddha, as supposed to be fixed by the Buddhists of Ceylon, at B.C. 543. But, in the work now under consideration, Professor Müller attacks with powerful arguments the authenticity and credibility of this date also: he points out that the Ceylon data, if compared with and corrected by the Greek era of Chandragupta, indicate rather 477 than 543 B.C. as Buddha’s death-year; and he argues farther, that the data themselves contain an artificial and arbitrary element which destroys their faith; and that back of the great synod under Aśoka, about 250 B.C., we really know nothing of the chronology of Buddhism. From this conclusion

we do not ourselves feel inclined to dissent; the considerations adduced by Müller as the ground of his scepticism are not easily to be set aside; and we have been taught, by long and sad experience, that a Hindu date is not a thing that one can clutch and hold. But while we pay our author homage in his character of Śiva, the Destroyer, we cannot show him equal reverence when he acts the part of Brahma, the Constructor; for the basis of evidence on which he founds his system of chronology for the Vedic literature seems to us far less substantial than that which had been relied upon to establish the date of Buddha's entrance upon nihility. Let us briefly review his reasonings. He begins with laying down as strongly as possible the marked distinctness of the periods represented by the three principal classes of the Vedic literature, showing that each class necessarily presupposes the existence and full development of that which precedes it: as regards the two later classes, he dwells upon the native distinction of them as *śruti* and *smṛiti*, 'revelation' and 'tradition,' respectively, contending that this implies a recognition of the latter as of notably later origin than the other. He farther divides the period of the Hymns into two, that of their composition and that of their collection and arrangement: the former he styles the *chhandas* period, the period of spontaneous poetic productiveness; the latter is the *mantra* period, that in which this poetry had become invested with a conventional and adscititious character,—had become *mantra*, 'sacred formula.' To such a division no Vedic scholar will refuse assent; the wide difference, in time and in character, between the singers and the diaskeuasts of the hymns has long been recognised, and has only failed to be marked by a suitable and happy nomenclature; that proposed by our author will probably henceforth be generally adopted. Professor Müller thus establishes four chronological steps, or separate and successive epochs of time; and, save that we may regard it as still uncertain how far these periods have interlaced with, or even slightly overlapped one another, we find nothing in his method to criticise."

Professor Whitney then proceeds to state some objections to the dates commonly assigned to Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, and he continues (p. 263): "Adopting 600—200 B.C. as the period of the *sūtra* literature, our author assumes that each of the two which preceded it may have lasted for a couple of centuries, and accordingly suggests as the epoch of the composition of the

Vedic Hymns the time prior to 1000 B.C.; or, if to it be assigned the same length as to the two succeeding epochs, 1200—1000 B.C. To this date for the beginnings of Hindu history and culture no one will deny at least the merit of extreme modesty and caution: it stands in this respect in most refreshing contrast with the theorizings of many others who have had occasion to treat the same point. The era of the Vedic poets is more likely to have preceded, perhaps considerably, the time thus allotted to it, than to have been more modern.....It is, upon the whole, clear that a final positive determination of the controversy, if ever attained, must be arrived at, not by following any one clew, however faithfully and perseveringly, but by carefully combining all evidences, whether literary, historical, astronomical, or of whatever other character they may be. Professor Müller can by no means be blamed for adhering to the general methods of his work, and refraining from entering upon those other lines of inquiry; but we should have been better satisfied if he had guarded against misapprehension by at least referring to their existence, and their indispensableness to the full solution of his problem."

I need hardly say that I agree with almost every word of my critics. I have repeatedly dwelt on the merely hypothetical character of the dates which I ventured to assign to the first three periods of Vedic literature. All I have claimed for them has been that they are minimum dates, and that the literary productions of each period which either still exist or which formerly existed, could hardly be accounted for within shorter limits of time than those suggested. Like most Sanskrit scholars, I feel that 200 years, or about six generations, are scarcely sufficient to account for the growth of the poetry and religion ascribed to the Chhandas period. There are vistas opened to those who are able to appreciate the perspective distances of thought which seem to reach to a much more remote past. But unless such general impressions can be clearly defined, so as to force conviction even from the prejudiced and the unwilling, it is worse than useless to express them at all. Nothing has brought Oriental studies into greater disrepute than the constant attempts of enthusiastic scholars to claim an exorbitant antiquity for the primitive civilisation of the East; and the equally unreasonable scepticism which rejects all history previous to 500 B.C. as fable or forgery, is but a natural reaction called forth by the over-confident assertions of the students of Egyptian, Babylonian, and Indian antiquities.

It has been pointed out, however, that although on the evidence of literature alone, no higher antiquity could have been claimed for the earliest poetry of India than the thirteenth century B. C., I ought to have strengthened my argument by additional evidence, and particularly by that of certain astronomical data which have long been brought forward as establishing the existence of Vedic poetry as early as the fifteenth century B. C. My reasons for not entering upon a discussion of these astronomical questions in a history of Sanskrit Literature have been rightly guessed by Professor Whitney. My object was to show how far the literary productions of the Vedic age could by themselves be made to bear witness to the antiquity of the Vedic religion and poetry. I was writing a history of Vedic Literature, not of Indian Astronomy. Nor could I have supposed that my not alluding to the trite arguments of Bentley, Colebrooke, Laplace, and Biot on the chronological meaning of certain astronomical observations preserved in certain Vedic treatises, could be so far misinterpreted as to expose me to the charge of either disregard for ignoring, or ignorance for disregarding the theories of those eminent scholars and astronomers. That I was not ignorant of their researches, I had shown by what I wrote in 1846, when first announcing my intention of publishing an edition of the Rig-veda. "With regard to the antiquity of the Veda," I then said, "the most striking remark is that of Colebrooke, bearing on an astronomical observation of the position of the colures. That observation is to be found in a small treatise appended to the Veda, which, partly by its position as a Vedānga or member of the Veda, partly by its general style, belongs to an earlier period than the great scientific astronomical works of Varāha Mihira, Brahmagupta, and others. These astronomers refer to that observation as one of earlier date, and we may well believe in its reality if we bear in mind that the Brahmans themselves never make use of it as a proof of the high antiquity of their sacred literature, nay, that they could not have done so, because, if used for chronological purposes, the date derived from that astronomical notice would stand in direct contradiction to their own system of chronology. Brahmagupta\*,

\* "En effet, Brahmagupta n'a pas eu l'avantage d'être un personnage mythologique. On sait qu'il a existé très-réellement vers la fin du vi<sup>e</sup> ou au commencement du vii<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère, et qu'il appartenait au collège d'Oojein, célèbre alors dans

l'Inde comme un centre de science astronomique." Biot, *Journal des Savants*, 1859. *Etudes sur l'Astronomie Indienne*, p. 31. Colebrooke (*Misc. Essays*, II, p. 463) established the date of Brahmagupta by the following process: "The star

who lived at the end of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh centuries, as proved by the position of the colures at his time, and who knew the observation of the earlier position of the colures, declares against the admission of a precession of the equinoctial points; and although other astronomers admitted a precession or vibration\*, yet they, too, were not in possession of sufficient observations to prove, still less to utilise for chronological purposes, a regular periodical precession of the equinoctial points. This is an argument which, as it reaches back to the fourteenth century B. C., may be used with advantage against those critics who cannot be convinced of the antiquity of any work except by figures and dates."

Chitrâ, which unquestionably is Spica Virginis, was referred by Brahmagupta to the 103rd degree counted from its origin to the intersection of the star's circle of declination; whence the star's right ascension is deduced  $182^{\circ} 45'$ . Its actual right ascension in A. D. 1800 was  $198^{\circ} 40' 2''$ . The difference,  $15^{\circ} 55' 2''$  is the quantity by which the beginning of the first zodiacal asterism and lunar mansion, Aśvinî, as inferrible from the position of the star Chitrâ, has receded from the equinox: and it indicates the lapse of 1216 years (to A. D. 1800) since that point coincided with the equinox; the annual precession of the star being reckoned at  $47'', 14$ . The star Revatî, which appears to be ζ Piscium, had no longitude, according to the same author, being situated precisely at the close of the asterism and commencement of the following one, Aśvinî, without latitude or declination, exactly in the equinoctial point. Its actual right ascension in 1800 was  $15^{\circ} 49' 15''$ . This, which is the quantity by which the origin of the Indian ecliptic, as inferrible from the position of the star Revatî, has receded from the equinox, indicates a period of 1221 years elapsed to the end of the eighteenth century; the annual precession of that star being  $46'', 63$ . The mean of the two is  $1218\frac{1}{2}$  years; which, taken from 1800, leaves 581 or 582 of the Christian era. Brahmagupta, then, appears to have observed and written towards the close of the sixth or the beginning of the following century; for, as the Hindu astronomers seem not to have been very accurate observers, the belief of his having lived and published in the seventh century,

about A. D. 628, which answers to 550 Saka, the date assigned to him by the astronomers of Ujjainî, is not inconsistent with the position, that the vernal equinox did not sensibly to his view deviate from the beginning of Aries or Mesha, as determined by him from the star Revatî (ζ Piscium), which he places at that point." Biot (Journ. des Sav., 1845, p. 41) gives 572 as corresponding to the equinox of ζ Piscium.

\* "L'autre notion que Colebrooke présentait encore comme propre aux Hindoux, c'était le mouvement de trépidation périodique attribuée par eux aux points équinoxiaux et solsticiaux de l'orbe solaire. Retrouvant plus tard cette idée dans Albategni et chez les Arabes d'Espagne, il la croyait dérivée des astronomes Hindoux par les communications qui s'établirent entre eux et les Arabes de Bagdad au temps du calife Almanzor." (Biot, Journal des Savants, 1845, pp. 383, 385, 447.) "Mais nous voyons aujourd'hui dans les tables manuelles de Théon, que cette idée était pareillement Alexandrine, et les doutes d'Hipparque sur la constance de durée de l'année tropique pourraient faire soupçonner qu'elle avait déjà cours au temps de ce grand observateur, puisqu'un mouvement d'oscillation supposé propre à l'orbe solaire produirait, en effet, des variations correspondantes dans cette durée. Si l'on admet une transmission directe ou indirecte des théories grecques dans l'Inde, comme cela paraît impossible à méconnaître, l'idée de la trépidation, qui en faisait partie, a dû y parvenir en même temps." Biot, l. c.



Though much has been written in the interval on Indian astronomy, and in particular on the possibility of deriving certain chronological dates from the astronomical observations alluded to before, I still adhere in the main to the opinion which I expressed sixteen years ago. But I do not intend to deny that many and very weighty objections may be urged against the use which Bentley and Colebrooke made of these observations, and I doubt whether an appeal even to the authority of a Colebrooke, the greatest of all Sanskrit scholars, is sufficient to silence the opposition of astronomers and historians. It may be as well to state some of these objections in order to warn those who allow themselves to be guided by the authority of even so eminent a scholar and astronomer as Colebrooke, against the dangers which this kind of authoritative belief invariably entails, namely, a tendency to shrink from the trouble of examining all evidence to the contrary, and to speak with greater certainty of the results obtained by independent inquirers than these inquirers themselves have claimed for their discoveries.

The first time that Colebrooke refers to the date of the Vedas is in the year 1801, in the seventh volume of the *Asiatic Researches* (p. 283), in a note to his article on the Religious Ceremonies of the Hindus, (*Miscellaneous Essays*, I. 200). In describing the offerings to the manes, Colebrooke mentions a prayer in which the six seasons, the hot, the dewy, the rainy, the flowery, the frosty, and the sultry, are enumerated; and he adds a passage from the Veda, first quoted by Sir W. Jones (*As. Res.* III. p. 258), in which these six seasons are each identified with what he considers two lunar months. He then argues in the following manner: "According to the Veda, the lunar months Madhu and Mádhava, or Chaitra and Vaiśákha, correspond with Vasanta or the spring. Now the lunar Chaitra, here meant, is the primary lunar month beginning from the conjunction which precedes full moon in or near Chitrá, and ending with the conjunction which follows it. Vaiśákha does in like manner extend from the conjunction which precedes full moon in or near Viśákhá to that which follows it. The five Nakshatras, Hasta, Chitrá, Sváti, Viśákhá, and Anurádhá\*, comprise all the asterisms in which

\* This statement is based on astronomical considerations, and is quite independent of the statements of later Indian astronomers, such as the author of the *Súrya-siddhánta*. As long as the Nakshatras are taken in their original sense, as twenty-seven equal divisions of the heavens, two months, or two-twelfths of the year, correspond, not with four, but with four and a half Naksha-

the full moons of Chaitra and Vaiśākha can happen; and these lunar months may therefore fluctuate between the first degree of Uttara-Phalgunī and the last of Jyeshthā. Consequently the season Vasanta might begin at soonest when the sun was in the middle of Pūrva-Bhādrapadā, or it might end at the latest when the sun was in the middle of Mrigaśiras. It appears, then, that the limits of Vasanta are Pisces and Taurus, that is, Mīna and Vṛisha. (This corresponds with a text which I shall forthwith quote from a very ancient Hindu author.) Now, if the place of the equinox did then correspond with the position assigned by Parāśara to the colures, Vasanta might end at the soonest seven or eight days after the equinox, or at latest thirty-eight or thirty-nine days; and on a medium (that is, when the full moon happened in the middle of Chitrā) twenty-two or twenty-three days after the vernal equinox. This agrees exactly with the real course of the seasons; for the rains do generally begin a week before the summer solstice, but their commencement does vary, in different years, about a fortnight on either side of that period. It seems therefore a probable inference, that such was the position of the equinox when the calendar of months and seasons was adjusted as described in this passage of the Veda. Hence I infer the probability, that the Vedas were not arranged in their present form earlier than the fourteenth century before the Christian Era."

It will be clear to every attentive reader, that the object of Colebrooke in these remarks is to protest against the received chronological notions of the Brahmans, who place the Veda at the beginning of the Kali-yuga, 3102 B.C.\* He wishes to show that it could not be older than the fourteenth century. This he states distinctly in what follows: "If the Vedas were compiled in India so early as the commencement of the astronomical Kali-yuga, the seasons must have then corresponded with other months; and the passage of the Veda, which shall be forthwith cited, must have disagreed with the natural course of the seasons at the very time it was written." But even if wishing only to fix the earliest possible date of the Veda, Colebrooke has taken many things for

tras. See Weber, *Nakshatras*, p. 348; and p. 358. I should have thought that Jyeshthā would be more likely as the fifth Nakshatra than Hasta; but all depends on the nature of the months, whether synodical or sidereal, a distinction which has been completely overlooked by late writers on this subject.

\* *Sūrya-siddhānta*, ed. Burgess and Whitney, p. 29.

granted which would not be granted to him at present. The passage of the Veda on which he builds his conclusion is, as he says, taken from Ápastamba's copy of the Yajur-veda, usually denominated the White Yajush. There is no copy, i. e. no śákhá, of Ápastamba for the White Yajush. But be that as it may, no such passage identifying the twelve months with the six seasons occurs in the Rig-veda; and the Yajur-veda, both the Black and the White, in which such passages\* do occur, belong to a secondary period of Vedic literature. This objection, however, applies only against Colebrooke as wishing to prove that the Veda could not be older than the fourteenth century. It is of no importance for our own objects.

But, secondly, the course of the seasons differs in different parts of India, and because in Central India the rains begin generally one week before the summer solstice, we are not at liberty to conclude that it was the same in the North of India, where the hymns of the Veda were composed.

Thirdly, the months and seasons would not at once have changed their names, even though they had ceased to coincide with the time of the year from which their names were originally derived, to say nothing of the different systems of counting time in different parts of India. We know from the Nirnayasinghu (Calcutta, 1833), that South of the Vindhya the lunar month begins with the moon's decrease, whereas in the North it begins with new moon or the moon's increase. It is said in the same work that a Bráhmaṇa begins his month with the new moon or Amávásya, a Kshatriya and Vaiśya with the Sankránti or the entrance of the sun into a new sign. In more ancient times we are told that the number of the seasons varied from three to five and six†, and that different castes began the year with different seasons‡.

Fourthly, the observation of the colures by Parásara and the calculated date of that observation as 1391 B. C. are taken for granted.

This argument therefore is, as Colebrooke himself has freely acknowledged,

\* The earliest passage is Taittiríya-Saṁhitá IV.

4, 11, 1. मधुश्च माधवश्च वासंतिकावृतू । शुक्रश्च शुचिश्च  
ग्रेष्मावृतू । नभश्च नभस्यश्च वार्षिक्यावृतू । इष्योर्जश्च शार-  
दावृतू । सहश्च सहस्यश्च हैमंतिकावृतू । तपश्च तपस्यश्च  
शैशिरावृतू ॥ For other passages see Boehtlingk and  
Roth, Sanskrit Dictionary, s. vv.

† Jyotisha-bhāṣya, p. 5<sup>b</sup>. पंचर्तवः संवत्सरस्येति च

ब्राह्मणं । तथा गर्गः त्रय चतुर्व इत्याह कृष्णात्रेयः । षट्  
गर्गः । चतुर्वो द्वादशेति नारदः । चतुर्विंशतिरिति भागुरिः ।  
दीपि शतानि सप्तदशिरित्याह क्रौडुकिः ।

‡ Jyotisha-bhāṣya, p. 3<sup>b</sup>. ननु यद्येवं कथमृतूनां वसंतो  
जायत आद्यस्तपूर्वाः श्रुतय इति उच्यते तासु वशीनां  
क्रमानुष्ठानाभिधायकत्वेन प्रवृत्ताः ।

"*vague and conjectural*," and, in the present state of Sanskrit scholarship, it ought no longer to be quoted.

Colebrooke, however, again touched on the same question in the year 1805, in his Essay on the Vedas, in the eighth volume of the Asiatic Researches, p. 471, Misc. Essays, I. p. 108. He had then met with the passage in the Jyotisha, so often quoted afterwards, where the solstitial points are mentioned, as at the beginning of Dhanishṭhā and the middle of Āśleshā, and he maintained that this situation of the cardinal points was true only in the fourteenth century B. C. Here two points have to be considered, 1. the character of the astronomical treatise, the Jyotisha; 2. the astronomical interpretation of the solstitial points as there mentioned.

The Jyotisha may have been written, as Colebrooke says, in the infancy of astronomical knowledge, but that it is later than the Rig-veda, later than the Yajur-veda, later than all the Brāhmanas and all the Vedic Sūtras, no one would doubt at present\*. What Colebrooke meant by infancy of astronomical knowledge, may best be gathered from the following facts. "The Jyotisha is adapted to the comparison of solar and lunar time with the vulgar or civil year. The cycle there employed is a period of five years only. The month is lunar, but at the end, and in the middle, of the quinquennial period, an intercalation is admitted, by doubling one month. Accordingly, the cycle comprises three common lunar years, and two, which contain thirteen lunations each. The year is divided into six seasons; and each month into half months. A complete lunation is measured by thirty lunar days; some of which must of course, in alternate months, be sunk, to make the dates agree with the nycthemera. For this purpose, the sixty-second day appears to be deducted†: and thus the cycle of five years consists of 1860 lunar days, or 1830 nycthemera, subject to a further correction, for the excess of nearly four days above the true sidereal year: but the exact quantity of this correction, and the method of making it, according to this calendar, have not yet been sufficiently investigated to be here stated. The zodiac is divided into twenty-seven asterisms, or signs, the first of which, both in the Jyotisha and the Vedas, is Kṛittikā,

\* M. M.'s History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 210 seq.

† "The Athenian year was regulated in a similar manner; but, according to Geminus, it was the

sixty-third day which was deducted. Perhaps this Hindu calendar may assist in explaining the Grecian system of lunar months." Colebrooke.

or the Pleiads. The place of the colures, according to these astronomical treatises, will be forthwith mentioned: but none of them hint at a motion of the equinoxes. The measure of a day by thirty hours, and that of an hour by sixty minutes, are explained, and the method of constructing a clepsydra is taught."

From these remarks it is clear, that though in one sense all this may be called the infancy of astronomy, the method of constructing a clepsydra and other scientific processes of a similar character are not exactly what we are prepared for when we speak of a knowledge of the stars and seasons in the fourteenth century B. C. The most important point, however, is this, that the passage which, according to Colebrooke, contains the statement of the solstitial points, such as they were, according to him, in the fourteenth century, does not occur in the Mantras, the age of which is certainly anterior to the tenth century B. C., nor in the Bráhmaṇas, nor in the Sūtras, but in a treatise, the Jyotisha, which no scholar would place higher than the third century B. C.\* This treatise was written, not for astronomical purposes, but to explain the principles for fixing the hours, days, and seasons of the ancient sacrifices. Even if it had been written but yesterday, the writer would have had to accommodate himself to the primitive ideas on the motions of the heavenly bodies, as prevalent in the liturgical traditions of the Brahmans, just as a scholar who writes on the festivals of the Greeks would have to speak in the primitive astronomical language of Greece, not in that of Copernicus. To make this clear I shall quote the introductory verses of the Jyotisha. The only MS. which I possess is that of the E. I. H. 1510, containing text and commentary. Colebrooke says, that the commentary is the work of an unknown author, and that it is accordingly assigned to a fabulous personage, Śeshanāga. This is

\* It is curious that no Sūtras on astronomy have as yet been discovered. Prose quotations on sacrificial astronomy occur here and there in commentaries, but they seem extracts from Kalpa-sūtras or Bráhmaṇas. Thus Somākara quotes Laṅgākṣhi as having said : माघ्याः पौर्णमास्याश्चतुरहः पुरस्तात् संवत्सराय दीक्षन्ते, 'four days before the full moon in Māgha, they sacrifice to the year,' i. e. to the new year. He likewise quotes Garga, sometimes in Ślokas, sometimes in prose; for instance : तथा च गर्गः । तेषां च सर्वेषां नक्षत्राणां कर्मसु कृत्तिकाः प्रथमाचक्षते ।

But these are passages such as occur frequently in Bráhmaṇas and Kalpa-sūtras, as when the Satapathabráhmaṇa and the Śāṅkhāyana-bráhmaṇa speak of the full moon in Phālguna as the first in the year, (या वैषा फाल्गुनी पौर्णमासी संवत्सरस्य प्रथमा रात्रिः), a passage which shows as clearly as possible that the full moon in Phalgunī is meant as the first in the year, not the Phālguna month, whether sidereal or synodical. Professor Weber (Nakshatra, p. 329) takes a different view.

indeed the name of the commentator as given at the end of the book (इति शेषनागकृतं ज्योतिःशास्त्रभाष्यं समाप्तं). But I believe we ought to read, इति शेषनागकृतज्योतिःशास्त्रभाष्यं, so that Śeṣhanāga, sometimes the name of Patanjali, would be the author of the text, whereas the commentary was composed by Somākara, as stated by himself (सोमाकरोऽहं विवृणोमि शक्त्या).

पंचसंवत्सरमययुगाध्यक्षं प्रजापतिं ।

दिनर्त्विजनमासांगं प्रणम्य शिरसा श्रुचिः ॥ १ ॥

ज्योतिषामयनं कृत्स्नं प्रवक्ष्याम्यनुपूर्वशः ।

ब्राह्मणेंद्राणां संमतं यज्ञकालार्थसिद्धये ॥ २ ॥ \*

“ Having bowed with my head to the lord of the universe, the overseer of the quinquennial Yuga, whose members are days, seasons, half-years, and months, I shall explain in order, full of purity, the whole course of the celestial luminaries, as it is approved by the chief Brahmans, for the accomplishment of those objects which are dependent on the times fixed for sacrifices.”

The next verse explained by the commentator does not occur here in the MSS. of the text †; but it is found towards the end of the Jyotisha, and is quoted also as belonging to this Vedāṅga in Rādhakant's Śabdakalpadruma :

\* As I differ in the translation of these two verses from the explanation given by the commentator, I subjoin his own words : एतेन श्लोकद्वयेन शास्त्रकारोऽभिधेयभूतामिष्टदेवतां नमस्कृत्य वस्तूपन्यासं करोति । तद्यथा । शुचिरहं । वाङ्मनःकायशुद्धौ ज्योतिषामयनं सूर्यचंद्रनक्षत्राणां गमनं वक्ष्यामि । कथयिष्यामि । कथं । अनुपूर्वशः । यज्ञाक्रमेणेत्यर्थः । कीदृशं । पुण्यं । यागकालविधिज्ञानतया पापहं । तथा संमतं ब्राह्मणेंद्राणां । यजमानानामभिप्रेतं । एते वै यज्ञस्येंद्रा इति श्रुतेः । किमर्थं । यज्ञकालार्थसिद्धये । यागचोदितकालविधानार्थमित्यर्थः । किं कृत्वा । प्रणम्य । नमस्कृत्य । कं । प्रजापतिं । स्रष्टारं । केन । शिरसा । उच्चमांगेन । कीदृशं । पंचसंवत्सरमयं । संवत्सरपरिवत्सरेदाधत्सरानुवत्सरेद्वत्सरात्मकं । तथा युगाध्यक्षं । कृतादीनां द्वादशानां च स्रष्टारं (द्रष्टारं?) । तथा दिनर्त्विजनमासांगं । कालावयवा दिनान्दयो यस्यांगानि ।

Other MSS. have विप्राणां संमतं लोके instead of ब्राह्मणेंद्राणां संमतं; the commentator reads मयं in the first and पुण्यं in the third line. Between the first and second, the following stanza is inserted :

प्रणम्य शिरसा कालमभिवाद्य सरस्वतीं ।

कालज्ञानं प्रवक्ष्यामि लगधस्य महात्मनः ॥

“ Having bowed with my head to Kāla (time), and having saluted Sarasvatī (goddess of eloquence), I shall promulgate the knowledge of time of the highminded Lagadha.” This would be important as giving the name of the reputed author, Lagadha; but the whole verse is ignored by the commentator. As Magadha is considered the birthplace of several of the exact sciences of the Hindus, and as particularly Magadha-measures were widely used in India after they had been first introduced or regulated by the physician Charaka and others, one might be led to suppose that the original reading had been *Māgadha*, meaning a native of Magadha. But all the MSS. agree in Lagadha in this as well as in another passage of the Jyotisha, without however giving any more information about the author.

† On the strength of this and similar differences other scholars admit two Jyotishas, one for the Rig-veda, another for the Yajur-veda. See my History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 211.

वेदा हि यज्ञार्थमभिप्रवृत्ताः कालानुपूर्व्या विहिताश्च यज्ञाः ।  
तस्मादिदं कालविधानशास्त्रं यो ज्योतिषं वेद स वेद यज्ञं ॥३॥

“The object of the Vedas is the sacrifice, and the sacrifices are instituted according to a certain order of time. Therefore whosoever knows this Jyotisha, imparting the doctrine of the regulation of time, he will know the sacrifice\*.”

The next verse, according to the commentary, is,

यथा शिखा मयूराणां नागानां मणयो यथा ।  
तद्वद्वेदांगशास्त्राणां गणितं मूर्ध्नि संस्थितं ॥४॥

“Like the crests of peacocks, like the gems (in the heads) of serpents, so is calculation placed at the head of the Vedānga doctrines.”

Then follows in the commentary :

माघशुक्लप्रपन्नस्य पौषकृष्णसमापिनः ।  
युगस्य पंचवर्षस्य कालज्ञानं प्रचक्षते ॥५॥

“They teach the knowledge of time of the quinquennial lustrum, which begins with the light half of the month Māgha, and ends with the dark half of the month Pausa†.”

Then follow the verses on which Colebrooke founded his chronological calculations :

\* Comm. वेदा ऋग्वेदादयः किल हि यस्माद्यज्ञार्थमभि-  
प्रवृत्ताः । अभिप्रपन्नाः प्रणीता उत्पन्नाः । तद्यथा स्मृतिः ।  
अग्निर्वायुरादित्यश्च त्वयं ब्रह्म सनातनं । दुदोह यज्ञसिद्धये-  
मृगयजुःसामलक्षणमिति । तथा कालानुपूर्व्या विहिताश्च  
यज्ञाः । दिनत्वयनेषु विभक्ताः श्रुताः । यथा पुण्याहे दीक्षा ।  
वसंते ज्योतिष्टोमेन यजेत । यजेत वाजपेयेन ग्रीष्म इति ।  
तथा पंचशारदीय इति । तस्मादिदं कालविधानशास्त्रं ।  
अनेन हि कालावयवा विज्ञायते । यो ज्योतिषं वेद स वेद  
यज्ञं । ज्योतिःशास्त्रज्ञः कालस्वरूपज्ञतया यथोक्तयज्ञफल-  
भागभवतीत्यर्थः । न वै सु विदुरिव पुष्यनक्षत्रमिति श्रुतिः ।  
तथा च परिशिष्टकृत् ।

मंत्रपादपदसंघिविधिज्ञो धातुनामवचनप्रकृतिज्ञः ।

ईदृशो भवति यज्ञविधिज्ञः पक्षमासतिथिचंद्रगतिज्ञः ॥

† Comm. एवमिह ज्योतिर्वेदः कालज्ञानं तत्स्वरूप-  
प्रतिपादनं वदंति । कस्य । युगस्य । कीदृशस्य । पंच-  
वर्षस्य । संवत्सरादीनां चैकीकृत्यं । यतश्चत्वारि मानानि  
वक्ष्यमाणानि । सौरसावनचंद्राब्दीणि । तेषां च यतः  
परस्परवैषम्येण कालवैषम्यं । यतः सावनस्य संवत्सरस्य  
प्रकृत्यैव षड् दिनानि लुप्यंते सौरमानापेक्षयाऽपंच-  
म्यानि (sic) तानि त्वधिकमासाभ्यामापूर्यंते । यतस्तौ द्वौ  
युगमध्ये भवतः । ते च युगा द्वादश । वैष्णवबार्हस्पत्यैर्द्रा-  
ग्नत्वाष्टाहिर्बुध्निपित्र्यसौम्यवैश्वदेवसर्षपार्यम्येण द्वाष्टभागाः ।  
तैः षष्ठ्यब्दनिष्पत्तिः । ततः काम्यं भवति । सौरमानापेक्षया  
तस्य कुतः प्रवृत्तिरित्याह । माघशुक्लेति । तदादिकालगण-  
नेत्यर्थः । तथा च लौगाक्षिः । माघ्याः पौर्णमास्याश्चतुरहः  
पुरस्तात्संवत्सराय दीक्षंत इति । एवमेव पौषकृष्णसमापिनः ।

स्वराक्रमेते सोमाकौ यदि साकं सवासवौ ।

स्यात्तदादि युगं माघस्तपः शुक्रोऽयनं ह्युदक् ॥ ६ ॥ \*

“ When the sun and moon ascend the sky together, being in the constellation over which the *Vasus* preside, then does the (quinquennial) cycle begin, and the (month) *Māgha*, and the warmth, and the bright (fortnight), for the path (of the sun) is north.”

प्रपद्येते श्रविष्ठादौ सूर्यचंद्रमसाबुदक् ।

सार्पाङ्गे दक्षिणार्कस्तु माघश्रावणयोः सदा ॥ ७ ॥ †

“ The sun and moon turn towards the north at the beginning of *S'ravishthā*; but the sun turns towards the south in the middle of the constellation over which the *Serpents* preside; and this (the turning towards the north and towards the south) always (happens) in (the month of) *Māgha* and *S'ravana* †.”

धर्मवृद्धिरपां प्रस्थः क्षपाहास उदग्गतौ ।

दक्षिणेतौ विपर्यस्तौ षण्मुहूर्त्ययनेन तु ॥ ८ ॥ §

“ In the northern progress, an increase of day and decrease of night take place, amounting to a prastha (or 32 palas) of water: in the southern progress, both are reversed (i. e. the days decrease and the nights increase), and (the difference consists), by the journey, of six muhūrtas.”

\* Comm. सवासवौ धनिष्ठायां नक्षत्रे इत्यर्थः । तथा च नक्षत्रे यदि बृहस्पतिरास्ते तदादिकमेतदित्याह । स्यात्तदादि युगं । तदादि युगप्रारंभो भवेत् । तथा तदैव माघो मास चतुर्विंश भवेत् । तथा स एव तपो मासो भवेत् । तपश्च तपस्यश्चेति श्रुतौ । तथा शुक्रः पक्ष इति वाक्यशेषः । तथा तदैव यस्मादुदगयनं भवेदिति प्रतिज्ञा ॥ ननु यद्येवं कथमृतानां वसंतो जायत आद्यः । तत्पूर्वाः श्रुतय इति । उच्यते । तास्तु वर्षानां कर्मानुष्ठानाभिधायकत्वेन प्रवृत्ताः ॥

† Comm. सर्वेषु युगेषु सूर्यचंद्रमसाबुदक्प्रवृत्तिं प्रपद्येते श्रविष्ठादौ । प्रथमेऽंशे । तथा सार्पाङ्गेऽश्लेषमध्ये ग्रीष्माते सूर्यो दक्षिणां प्रपद्यते । एवं तस्यायनं माघश्रावणयोः सर्वकालं पंचस्वपि संवत्सरेष्वित्यर्थः ।

‡ How this bears on the proper time for certain sacrifices may be seen from passages like तत्र पशुर्नित्यः काम्यश्च । तत्र नित्यः षट्सु मासेषु यावज्जीवं प्रयोज्यः ।

माघमासे धनिष्ठानक्षत्रगते सवितर्येकस्य पशोः कालः । आषाढ आश्लेषोत्तरार्द्धगते सवितर्येकस्य पशोः कालः (MS. E. I. H. p. 288, 2). “ The animal sacrifice is either obligatory or voluntary. The obligatory one must be performed every six months during life. The time for one is in the month of *Māgha*, when the sun has gone to the Nakshatra *Dhanishṭhā*; the time for the other is the month *Aślāṣā*, when the sun has entered into the second half of *Aślāṣā*.”

§ Comm. तस्य सूर्यस्योदग्गतौ निमित्ते धर्मवृद्धिर्भवतीति वाक्यशेषः । धर्म इत्यहर्नाम । धर्मो ग्रंथो घृणिरित्यहर्नामसु षडितं । तथा क्षपाहासः । क्षपेति रात्रिनाम । क्षपा शर्वरीति रात्रिनामसु षडितं । तदाप्रभृति दिनानि वर्धते । रात्रिश्चापक्षीयते । एवमेव तस्य दक्षिणेतौ विपर्ययः । कियती वृद्धिरित्याह । षण्मुहूर्ता । एवमयने वृद्धिहासौ । तथा च सापि कियतीत्याह । प्रस्थः । द्वाविंशत्यलिकमित्यर्थः ।



It is, however, only in the first year of each quinquennial cycle, that Sun and Moon are said to be together on the first of Mággha, in the Constellation of the Vasus, at the winter solstice. For the intervening years their relative position is thus given :

1st Year (called Samvatsara \*, sacred to Agni).

Winter solstice: Sun, } 1st of Mággha, { in the beginning of S'ravishthá.  
Moon, } { in the beginning of S'ravishthá.

Summer solstice: Sun, } 7th of S'rávana, { in the middle of Áśleshá.  
Moon, } { in Chitrá.

2nd Year (called Parivatsara, sacred to Arka).

Winter solstice: Sun, } 13th of Mággha, { in the beginning of S'ravishthá.  
Moon, } { in Árdra.

Summer solstice: Sun, } 4th of S'rávana (dark half), { in the middle of Áśleshá.  
Moon, } { in Púrva-Bhádrapadá.

3rd Year (called Idávatsara, sacred to Váyu).

Winter solstice: Sun, } 10th of Mággha (dark), { in the beginning of S'ravishthá.  
Moon, } { in Anurádhá.

Summer solstice: Sun, } 1st of S'rávana, { in the middle of Áśleshá.  
Moon, } { in the middle of Áśleshá.

4th Year (called Anuvatsara, sacred to Indra).

Winter solstice: Sun, } 7th of Mággha, { in the beginning of S'ravishthá.  
Moon, } { in Áśviní.

Summer solstice: Sun, } 13th of S'rávana, { in the middle of Áśleshá.  
Moon, } { in Púrva Ashádhá.

5th Year (called Idvatsara, sacred to Mṛityu).

Winter solstice: Sun, } 4th of Mággha (dark), { in the beginning of S'ravishthá.  
Moon, } { in Uttara Phalguní.

Summer solstice: Sun, } 10th of S'rávana, { in the middle of Áśleshá.  
Moon, } { in Rohiní †.

\* On these names see Weber, *Naxatra*, p. 298; *Taitt. S. V*, 5, 7, 3, 4. *Váj. Sanh.* 27, 45. *Taitt. Br. III*, 10, 4, 1. *Káth.* 13, 15; 39, 6; 40, 6 (five). *Váj. S. XXX*, 5. *Taitt. A. IV*, 19, 1 (six). *Panchav. Br. XVII*, 13, 17. *Taitt. Br. I*, 4, 10, 1 (four). *Taitt. S. V*, 7, 2, 4. *Ath. Sanh. VI*, 55, 3 (three). *Taitt.*

*A. X*, 80. *Kaus.* 42 (two). See also Boehtlingk and Roth, s. vv.

† This would show that the months are to be considered as sávana months of 30 Ahorátras each, and that therefore 12 such months + 12 days are necessary to fill a lunar year of 372 days. In order

These extracts are sufficient to enable astronomers to form an idea of the real character of this treatise, which altogether consists of about thirty-six verses. It was clearly written at a time when more was known of astronomy than was required for the ancient calendar of the Vedic festivals. The general notions which its author lays down for fixing the beginning of the year, the months, and seasons, and the proper times of the Vedic sacrifices, had been handed down by the tradition of priestly families; they were not invented by himself. He was forced to surrender the more scientific astronomical notions current in his own time, and had to adapt himself to the more primitive notions of those who had composed the hymns and Bráhmaṇas, and had settled the sacrifices of the Vedic age. He may have reduced those primitive astronomical notions to a more systematic form than they ever had in the minds of the early Rishis; but in a case like the one which occupies us at present, the beginning of the year and the position of the solstitial points, we may fairly grant to Colebrooke and others, that there was a real tradition which fixed these important points as they are fixed in the Jyotisha; nay, we may believe that for sacrificial purposes these points were still supposed to be in the same position even at a time when, by the laws of nature, they had considerably receded from it.

The next question, then, which arises is this, Does the traditional position of the solstitial points, as recorded in the Jyotisha, point back to the fourteenth century B. C. as the only time in which it could have been the result of actual observation? Colebrooke does not enter into details. He simply affirms that the position of the solstitial points at the beginning of Dhanishthá and in the middle of Áśleshá could have been a reality at no time except in the fourteenth century B. C. He depends, in fact, on Davis, who, in his *Essay on the Astronomical Computations of the Hindus* (As. Res. II. p. 268), recorded the position of the colures, as observed by Parásara,—this being identical with that of the Jyotisha;—and on Sir W. Jones, who, in a *Supplement to this Essay* (As. Res. II. 393), touched on the same subject. After fixing the date of Varáha Mihira, from the observation of the solstitial points at his time, at 499 A.D., Sir William writes: “By Newton’s demonstrations, which agree as well with the pheno-

to bring the winter solstice, which in the third year falls on the 10th of Mágha (dark half), in the fourth year back to the 7th of Mágha (light half), a month of 30 days must have been intercalated; and in the same manner another sávana month

must have been added at the end of the fifth year, in order to bring the winter solstice, which fell upon the 4th of Mágha (dark half), back to the 1st of Mágha (light half).

mena as the varying density of our earth will admit, the equinox recedes about 50" every year, and has receded  $17^{\circ} 55' 50''$  since the time of Varáha, which gives us more nearly in our own sphere the first degree of Mesha in that of the Hindus. By the observation recorded in older Śástras, the equinox had gone back  $23^{\circ} 20'$ , or about 1680 years had intervened between the age of the Muni (Parásara) and that of the modern astronomer: the former observation, therefore, must have been made about 2971 years before the 1st January 1790, that is, 1181 before Christ."

In the fifth volume, however, of the Asiatic Researches, p. 288, Colonel Wilford published the following new Supplement to Sir W. Jones' Supplement:

"It has been stated," he writes, "that Paráśara lived about 1180 years B.C., in consequence of an observation of the places of the colures. But Mr. Davis having considered this subject with the minutest attention, authorizes me to say, that this observation must have been made 1391 years B.C. This is also confirmed by a passage from the Paráśara-Saṁhitá, in which it is declared, that the Udaya or heliacal rising of Canopus (when at the distance of thirteen degrees from the sun, according to the Hindu astronomers) happened in the time of Paráśara on the tenth of Kárttika; the difference now amounts to twenty-three degrees. Having communicated this passage to Mr. Davis, he informed me that it coincided with the observation of the places of the colures in the time of Paráśara."

Thus vanishes the fourteenth century; and a fact which was spoken of as beyond the reach of doubt, dwindles down to a statement made by Colonel Wilford, the result of a private conversation with Mr. Davis! With all possible regard for Mr. Davis and Colonel Wilford, we cannot accept such assertions in lieu of proof.

The astronomical interpretation of the position of the solstitial points, as recorded in the Jyotisha, led Mr. Bentley to the year 1181 B.C. Archdeacon Pratt, who lately reexamined the whole evidence, arrives at the same result. His calculations may best be stated in his own words, from a letter addressed by him to Professor Cowell, March 21st, 1862\*.

"In reply to your question, How did Colebrooke deduce the age of the Vedas from the passage which he quotes from the Jyotisha or Vedic Calendar in his Essays (vol. I. p. 110)? I beg to send you the following remarks:

\* Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1862, p. 51.

"In that passage it is stated that the winter solstice was, at the time the Vedas were written (?), at the beginning of S'ravishthá or Dhanishthá, and the summer solstice at the middle of Áśleshá.

"Now the Hindus divided the Zodiac into twenty-seven equal parts, called *Lunar Mansions*, of  $13^{\circ} 20'$  each. Their names are

1. Aśviní	10. Maghá	19. Múla
2. Bharaní	* 11. P. Phalguní	20. P. Áśhádhá
3. Kṛttiká	12. U. Phalguní	21. U. Áśhádhá
4. Rohiní	13. Hasta	22. Śravaṇa
5. Mrigaśíras	14. Chitrá	23. Dhanishthá
6. Ardrá	15. Sváti	24. Śatabhishá
7. Punarvasu	16. Viśákhá	25. P. Bhádrapadá
8. Pushya	17. Anurádhá	26. U. Bhádrapadá
9. Áśleshá	18. Jyeshthá	27. Revatí.

"The position of these lunar mansions among the stars is determined by the stars themselves and not by the sun, and is therefore unaffected by the precession of the equinoxes. If, therefore, we can determine their position at any one epoch, we know their position for all time. The Hindu books furnish us with the requisite information. In the translation of the *Súrya-siddhánta*, published in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, Chap. VIII. p. 62, you will find that the conspicuous star Regulus, or  $\alpha$  Leonis, is placed by the Hindu astronomers at 4 signs, 9 degrees from the beginning of these lunar mansions (or asterisms, as they are there called). As 4 signs equal one-third of the whole zodiac, they equal 9 lunar mansions. Hence the position of Regulus is  $9^{\circ}$  in Maghá, the 10th lunar mansion.

"But by the Jyotisha, the summer solstice was in the middle of Áśleshá, the 9th lunar mansion, at the epoch of the Vedas: therefore Regulus was half a lunar mansion +  $9^{\circ}$ , that is,  $15^{\circ} 40'$ , east of the summer solstice at that time.

"By the *Nautical Almanac* for 1859, the position of Regulus is given as follows:—

"Right ascension, January 1st, 1859,	...	...	10 h. 0 m. 53 s.
"North declination, ditto,	...	...	$12^{\circ} 39' 12'' \cdot 7$ .

"From this I obtain, by spherical trigonometry, the following result:—

"Longitude of Regulus, January 1st, 1859,	...	$147^{\circ} 52' 30''$ .
---	-----	--------------------------

"Hence Regulus was east of the summer solstice at that date by  $57^{\circ} 52' 30''$ . The summer solstice had, therefore, retrograded through  $42^{\circ} 12' 30'' = 42^{\circ} 208$  since the epoch of the Vedas. As the equinoxes and solstices move backward on the ecliptic at the rate of  $1^{\circ}$  in 72 years, it must have occupied  $72 \times 42^{\circ} 208 = 3039$  years to effect this change.

"Hence the age of the Vedas was 3039 on 1st January, 1859; or their date is 1181 B. C., that is, the early part of the twelfth century before the Christian era.

"This differs from Mr. Colebrooke's result: he makes it the fourteenth century. Two more degrees of precessional motion would lead to this; but where he gets these from, I do not know, unless it be by taking the *constellations* loosely, instead of the exact lunar mansions. Thus Dhanishthá being taken to be the lunar mansion above which the Dolphin occurs, it is possible that he may have considered the first star in the constellation Dolphin to be the 'beginning of Dhanishthá' alluded to in the Jyotisha; and similarly he may have taken a star in the middle of Hydra's head to represent the 'middle of Áśleshá.' But even this supposition will not carry us into the fourteenth century. If we take the first star  $\epsilon$  in Dolphin and the opposite star  $\zeta$  in Hydra's head to be the solstitial points, the precessional motion will only be about  $40'$  more than above, and the date will be B. C. 1229 or late in the thirteenth century. But then  $\zeta$  is not in the middle of Hydra's head; it is about  $2^{\circ}$  east of it; and therefore I have no doubt the lunar mansion, and not the constellation, is what the Jyotisha refers to, and the early part of the twelfth century is the correct result."

This lucid statement of so careful a reasoner as Archdeacon Pratt shows clearly that the position of the solstitial points as recorded in the Jyotisha, belongs to the twelfth, not to the fourteenth century B. C.

It is not my wish to invalidate the conclusions that have been drawn from the recorded observation of the colures. But I feel bound to remark that unless there was internal evidence that the Vedic hymns reached back to that remote antiquity, this passage in the Jyotisha would by itself carry no weight whatever. First, it might be perfectly true that such an observation was really made, as recorded in the Jyotisha, but where is there the slightest hint that at the same time a single Vedic hymn had been in existence, or, as has been asserted with greater boldness than discretion, that a collection of Vedic hymns was completed? As well might we say that because the Prayer-book contains a Table to find Easter-day founded on the Gregorian Calendar, therefore the

Service for Charles the Martyr must have been composed, and the collection of the Prayer-book have been completed before the year 1582. But, secondly, the manner in which the observations of the solstitial points are recorded, is so vague and unscientific that any astronomical critic, at all unfriendly to the pretensions raised by Sanskrit scholars in favour of a high antiquity of the Vedic hymns, could dissect them without difficulty. What is thought of the accuracy of Indian observations even when, after the model of the Greek, they had framed a system of scientific astronomy, may be seen from the remarks of Professor Whitney, *Súrya-siddhánta*, pp. 212 and 220. It is not too much to say, and every practical astronomer I have consulted has confirmed my opinion, that, to judge from their much later performances, the Bráhmans in the twelfth century B. C. had no means for observing with astronomical accuracy the solstitial points, a task by no means easy even at the present day; and in deducing any chronological dates from observations so loosely recorded as those of the Jyotisha, a margin of several centuries ought to be left on either side.

The truth therefore is simply this, that the dates derived from the observation of the solstitial points in the Jyotisha are welcome as confirmatory evidence, after we have from internal evidence established the existence of Vedic poetry in the twelfth century B. C., but by itself this observation would be of no use for establishing the age of Vedic literature.

As I have been obliged to enter so fully into a controversy which most Sanskrit scholars would consider as closed long ago, I may, for completeness sake, mention one or two attempts of the same kind which, if too much importance has been attributed to Colebrooke's speculations—not, however, by himself, but by his indiscriminate admirers—have been treated with perhaps greater neglect than they deserved.

Bentley, in his *Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy*, (Calcutta, 1823,) a work which has been justly criticised by Professor Whitney in his *Súrya-siddhánta*, has the following remarks. After treating of the position of the solstitial points, the same as recorded in the Jyotisha, and deducing from it the date 1181 B. C., he states that at a still earlier period the autumnal equinox was, not as in 1181 B. C. at 3' 20" of the asterism Visákhá, but just on the middle of it, and that hence the name of Visákhá. According to Bentley, Visákhá received its name from the equinoxial colure cutting it in the middle, and thereby bisecting it, or dividing it into two equal sections or branches.

Although the meaning commonly ascribed to *viśákha* is 'branchless,' yet *viśákha* may mean, and originally did mean, 'possessed of two expanded branches,' 'branched,' 'bisected,' like *vidala*, 'opened,' 'split,' *vidruma*, 'coral,' i. e. 'with expanded stems,' and other adjectives in which *vi*, before a substantive, is not used in a privative sense. So far nothing could be said against Bentley's view. But that the asterism *Viśákhá* was so called from the equinoxial colure bisecting it, and not from any other cause, is a mere conjecture, which may be right or wrong, but which requires stronger proof than Bentley has adduced in support of it. He maintains that the original name of the asterism was *Rádhá*, and he takes the name of the asterism immediately following, *Anurádhá*, in the sense of *post-Rádhā*. He then proceeds to adjust the other points in accordance with the autumnal equinox bisecting *Viśákhá*, which gives him (page 2)—

The vernal equinoxial point in the beginning of *Kṛittiká*;  
 The summer solstice in  $10^{\circ}$  of *Áśleshá*;  
 The autumnal equinox in the middle of *Rádhá*, thence called *Viśákhá*;  
 And the winter solstice in  $3^{\circ} 20'$  of *Dhanishṭhá*.

He then proceeds:

"In order to ascertain the time when this observation was made, we must find the precession from the position of some of the fixed stars at the time. Thus the longitude of *Cor Leonis* (*Regulus*) in the lunar mansion *Maghá* is always  $9^{\circ}$ . The vernal equinoxial point was found by the observation to be in the beginning of *Kṛittiká*; and from the beginning of *Kṛittiká* to the beginning of *Maghá* is seven lunar mansions of  $13^{\circ} 20'$  each, and therefore equal to  $93^{\circ} 20'$

Add longitude of <i>Cor Leonis</i> in <i>Maghá</i> .....	9	0
Their sum is the longitude of <i>Cor Leonis</i> from <i>Aries</i> .....	102	20
Longitude of <i>Cor Leonis</i> in A. D. 1750 was .....	146	21
Difference in the precession .....	44	1,

or the quantity by which the equinoxes fell back in respect of the fixed stars since the time of the observation. Now to find the number of years corresponding to this precession, it must be observed that, as we go back into antiquity, the rate of precession diminishes about  $2''$ , 27 for every century. If we assume that the observation was made 1450 B. C., then  $\frac{1450 + 1750}{2} = 1600$ ; from which subtracting 1450, we get A. D. 150 for the middle point. Now in the first century of the Christian era, the precession was  $1^{\circ} 23' 6''$ , 4, to which if we add  $2''$ , 27, we get  $1^{\circ} 23' 8''$ , 67 for the mean precession; that is to say, the precession that

corresponds to the second century of the Christian era, in which the middle point is found. Therefore, as  $1^{\circ} 23' 8''65$  is to 100 years, so  $44^{\circ} 1'$  to 3176 years; from which subtracting 1750, we get 1426 B. C. for the time of the observation, and the formation of the lunar mansions."

It cannot be denied that the same objections which apply to Colebrooke's calculations, apply in a still stronger degree to this argument of Bentley's. But, with these necessary qualifications, Bentley's statements are certainly deserving of more attention than they have hitherto received. Though I know of no passage in Vedic literature \* where the vernal equinox is referred, by astronomical observation, to the lunar mansion of the Kṛittikás, it is true that the Kṛittikás occupy the first place in all the ancient lists of the Nakshatras, even when it is distinctly stated that the winter solstice was at the beginning of Śravishtá, and hence the vernal equinox at the last quarter of Bharanī. For sacrificial purposes, in fact, the Kṛittikás are always to be considered as occupying the first place among the Nakshatras †, and in the Jyotisha itself, though the vernal equinox would fall, as we saw, at the end of Bharanī, Agni, the presiding deity of the Kṛittikás, stands first in the list. The same applies to the lists of the Nakshatras contained in the Taittirīya-Saṁhitā IV. 4, 10, 1; and in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa I. 5, 1, 1. In the Taitt. Br. I. 5, 1, 7, it is distinctly stated that the Nakshatras of the gods begin with the Kṛittikás and end with Viśákhá; whereas the Nakshatras of Yama (so called because Yama presides over the last of them) begin with the Anúrādhás and end with the Apabharaṇís. In the third book of the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa, the Kṛittikás, with Agni as their deity, occupy again the first place. Even in the Atharva-veda (I. 19, 7), in a passage of decidedly modern date, and in the Law-book of Yājñavalkya (I. 267), the Kṛittikás continue to occupy their early position.

Although, however, the Kṛittikás retained their place even in later works which treat of sacrificial and astrological subjects, they were supplanted by the lunar mansion of Aśvinī in the later astronomical literature. At what time that change took place is difficult to determine with exactness. It could not have been till the vernal equinox actually touched Aśvinī, having receded from the Kṛittikás and from the intervening mansion of Bharanī. It must have been before Varāha Mihira (499 A. D.), at whose time the equinox fell in the beginning

\* The vernal equinox is referred to the first degree of Kṛittiká in later works; for instance, in the Vishṇu-Purāṇa, p. 224.

† तेषां सर्वेषां नक्षत्राणां कर्त्तव्यः कृत्तिकाः प्रथममाचक्षते । Jyotisha-bhāṣya, p. 3. a.



of Áśviní. All works in which the lists of the Nakshatras begin with Áśviní must be later than the first year in which the equinox touched Áśviní, and this would tend to fix the date of the Amara-kosha (I. 1, 2, 23) and other works\*; but it does by no means follow that works in which the Kṛittikás are mentioned as the first Nakshatra are therefore prior even to Varáha Mihira, nor has it ever been proved by Bentley or by others, that any actual observation took place when the equinox coincided with Kṛittiká.

The Kṛittikás, as has been shown by Colebrooke and others, are the same stars which are familiar to us under the name of the Pleiads; and it is curious to observe that the same uncertainty as to their number, which in Greece gave rise to well-known legends †, existed to a certain degree in India. The statement in Boehtlingk and Roth's Dictionary, that their number was six, is, in this general form, hardly correct; for though that number is given in later astronomical works (see Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays, II. 331; Sūrya-siddhānta, ed. Whitney, p. 184), the earliest authorities speak of the Kṛittikás as seven. Their names are mentioned (Taitt. Sanh. IV. 4, 5, 1, and Taitt. Br. III. 1, 4, 1); as, 1. Ambá, 2. Dulá, 3. Nitatni, 4. Abhrayantí, 5. Meghayantí, 6. Varshayantí, 7. Chupuníká ‡. It was therefore not a numerical fancy which in Greece fixed the number of the Pleiads at seven; but it is more likely that one of the seven stars, which Hipparchus still affirms to have been visible in a clear moonless night, lost its primitive splendour,—a fact by no means without a parallel in the history of astronomy.

The next calculation of Bentley's shows his ingenuity as much as his want of critical caution. The names of the planets on which he builds his theory are believed to be of very modern origin §, or, at all events, they have never been met with as yet either in the Vedas, or in any of the early productions of Sanskrit literature. Nevertheless, if his calculations are right, the coincidence between these modern names and the ancient astronomical facts to which they owe their origin, is all the more interesting, and requires an explanation at the hands of experienced astronomers. Daksha, says the legend, gave his twenty-seven daughters, the lunar asterisms, to the moon. From the union of the

\* Cf. Hemachandra-kosha, 108.

† Sir C. Lewis, Historical Survey of the Astronomy of the Ancients, p. 65.

‡ Their number is stated by the commentators on Taitt. Br. I. 5, 1. The third name is Nitatni

in the Taitt. Sanh.

§ The Vāyu-Purāṇa appeals to the Śruti, the Hinga-Purāṇa to the Smṛiti, in support of the legendary derivation of the names of the planets. See Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, p. 225.

daughters of Daksha with the moon, the ancient(?) astronomers feigned the birth of four of the planets, that is to say, Mercury from Rohinī; hence he is called Rohiṇeya after his mother. Maghā brought forth the beautiful planet Venus; hence one of the names of that planet is Maghābhū. The lunar mansion Ashādhā brought forth the martial planet Mars, who was thence called Ashādhābhava, and Pūrva phalgunī brought forth Jupiter, the largest of all the planets, and the tutor of the gods; hence he is called Pūrva-phalgunībhava: the moon, the father, being present at the birth of each. The observations here alluded to are supposed by Bentley to have been occultations of the planets by the moon, in the respective lunar mansions from which they are named. They are supposed to be occultations, because they are not made in the time of a single revolution of the moon, but take place in the space of about sixteen months, from 19th August 1425, to the 19th April 1424 B. C.; and this idea of the observations being confined to occultations is supported by Saturn not being included, because that planet was then out of the moon's course. These occultations would refer us to the years 1424-5 B. C., thus corroborating the result of the observation of the colures.

The planet Mercury and the Moon in Rohinī, 17th April 1424 B. C.

The planet Jupiter and the Moon in Pūrva Phalgunī, 23rd April 1424 B. C.

The planet Mars and the Moon in Pūrva Ashādhā, 19th August 1424 B. C.

The planet Venus and the Moon in Maghā, 19th August 1425 B. C.

All within the space of about sixteen months; and there is no other year, as Bentley affirms, either before that period or since, in which they were so placed or situated. Saturn is not mentioned among these births, probably from his being situated out of the moon's course; but was feigned to have been born afterwards from the shadow of the earth, at the time of churning the ocean, or the war between the gods and the giants."

Finally, Bentley maintains that the names of the twelve Indian months could only have been formed in 1181 B. C. His argument is this:

The position of the twenty-seven lunar mansions at this period would have been as follows:

Names of Nakshatras.	Later Names.	Names of presiding Deities.
1. Śravishtāhā (fem.) 4	Śravishtāhā, Dhanishtāhā	Vasavaḥ (8)
2. Śatabhishak	Śatabhishak	Indraḥ (Varuṇaḥ III)
3. Pūrve Proshthapadāḥ (masc.)	P. Bhādrapadā	Aja Ekapād
4. Uttare Proshthapadāḥ	U. Bhādrapadā	Ahir Budhniyaḥ
5. Revatī	Revatī	Pūshā
6. Āśvayujau	Āśvinī	Āśvinau
7. Apabharaṇīḥ (Bharaṇī III)	Bharaṇī	Yamaḥ
8. Kṛittikāḥ 7 (fem.)	Kṛittikā	Agniḥ
9. Rohiṇī	Rohiṇī (Brāhmī, Hem. K.)	Prajāpatiḥ
10. Invakāḥ (Mṛigaśīrsham III)	Mṛigaśīras. Āgrahāyaṇī, A. K.	Somaḥ
11. Bāhū (Ārdrā III)	Ārdrā	Rudraḥ
12. Punarvasū	Punarvasu (Yāmakau, H. K.)	Aditiḥ
13. Tishyāḥ	Pushya (Sidhya, A. K.)	Bṛhaspatiḥ
14. Āśleshāḥ (Āśreshāḥ, fem. III)	Āśleshā	Sarpāḥ
15. Maghāḥ (fem.) (Aghāḥ, R. V.)	Maghā	Pitaraḥ
16. Purve Phalgunī (-nīḥ III) (Arjunī, R. V.)	P. Phālgunī	Aryamā (17th)
17. Uttare Phalgunī (fem. dual)	U. Phālgunī	Bhagaḥ (16th)
18. Hastaḥ	Hasta	Devāḥ Savitā
19. Chitrā	Chitrā	Indraḥ (Tvashṭā III)
20. Nishtyā (Svātī, T. S.)	Svātī	Vāyuḥ
21. Viśākhē	Viśākhā (Rādhā, A. Kosh.)	Indra-Agnī
22. Anurādhāḥ (masc.)	Anurādhā	Mitraḥ
23. Rohiṇī, Jyeshthaghñī (Jyeshthā III)	Jyeshthā	Indraḥ
24. Mūlabarhaṇī (Mūlam III. Vichṛitau, T. S.)	Mūla	Nirṛitiḥ (Prajāpatiḥ III), Pitaraḥ, T. S.
25. Purvā Ashāḍhāḥ (fem.)	P. Ashāḍhā	Āpaḥ
26. Uttarā Ashāḍhāḥ	U. Ashāḍhā	Viśve Devāḥ
Abhijit (III)	Abhijit	Brahmā (III)
27. Śrōṇā	Śravaṇa	Vishṇuḥ
<p>Names given from Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa, I. 5. 1 &amp; 2. Important variations occurring in Taittirīya-Br., III. 1. 1-6, marked III: others from Taittirīya-Saṁhitā, IV. 4. 10, marked T. S.</p> <p>Modern names as collected by Prof. Whitney, Śūrya-siddh. p. 183. A. K. means Amara-kosha, H. K. Hema-chandra-kosha.</p>		

# P R E F A C E.

XXXV

Six Seasons.	Twelve Months.	Asterisms in which full moon may occur, according to Śūrya-siddh. p. 270.		Position of the Sun, 1181 B. C.
	1. Mághaḥ,	Tapas	XIV. XV.	Winter solstice, beginning of Śraviṣṭhā. Udag-ayanam.
Śīśirāḥ (Thaw)	2. Phālgunāḥ,	Tapasyāḥ	XVI. XVII. XVIII.	
	3. Chaitrah,	Madhuḥ	XIX. XX.	(Vernal equinox, coinciding with Revatī (♏ Piscium), time of Brahmagupta, 582 A. D.)
				(Vernal equinox, beginning of Āsvinī, time of Varāha Mihira, 499 A. D.)
Vasantāḥ (Spring)	4. Vaiśākhaḥ,	Mādhavaḥ	XXI. XXII.	Vernal equinox, last quarter of Bharanī, 1181 B. C.
	5. Jyāishṭhāḥ,	Śukrah	XXIII. XXIV.	
Grīṣmaḥ (Summer)	6. Āśādhāḥ,	Suchiḥ	XXV. XXVI.	
	7. Śrāvaṇaḥ,	Nabhas	XXVII. I.	Summer solstice, middle of Āśleṣhā.
Varṣaḥ (Rain)	8. Bhādrapadaḥ,	Nābhasyāḥ	II. III. IV.	
	(Prausṭhāpadaḥ)			
	9. Āśvinaḥ,	It	V. VI. VII.	
	(Āśvayujāḥ)			
Śarad (Harvest)	10. Kārttikaḥ,	Ūrk	VIII. IX.	Autumnal equinox, second quarter of Viśākhā.
	11. Mārgaśīrshaḥ,	Sahāḥ	X. XI.	
Hemantaḥ (Winter)	12. Pauṣaḥ,	Sahasyāḥ	XII. XIII.	
	(Tāishāḥ)			

There can be no doubt that the names of the months, Mágha, Phálguna, Chaitra, Vaisákha, Jyeshṭha, Ásháḍha, Śrávaṇa, Bhádra, Áśvina, Kárttika, Márghasírsa, and Pausha were derived from the names of the twelve lunar mansions, Maghá, Phalguní, Chitrá, Viśákhá, Jyeshṭhá, Asháḍhá, Śravaṇa, Bhadrá, Ásviní, Kṛittiká, Mrigaśíras, and Pushyá. But it is at first sight difficult to explain why the succession of the months is so different from that of the lunar asterisms. When the sun stands in Śravishṭhá, with the Vasus, the month is called Mágha, but Maghá is not the first, but the fifteenth Nakshatra; and when the sun is in Áśleshá, with the Serpents, the month is called Śrávaṇa, while Śravaṇa is not the fourteenth, but the twenty-seventh Nakshatra.

Bentley offers the following explanation :

“In the same manner as the lunar mansions were fabled by the Hindu poets to have been married to the moon, and that the first offspring of that poetic union were four of the planets; the Hindu poets feign, that the twelve months sprang from the same union, each month deriving its name in the form of a patronymic, from the lunar mansions in which the moon was supposed to be full at the time.

“Let us therefore, in the case before us, apply this principle. At the above epoch, 1181 B. C., the sun and moon were in conjunction at the winter solstice; and as the months began when the sun entered the signs, the first month therefore began at the winter solstice. Now to find the name of that month, the moon would be full at about  $14\frac{2}{3}$  days after the winter solstice, and would then be in the opposite part of the heavens to the sun. The sun would have advanced in  $14\frac{2}{3}$  days about  $14^{\circ}\frac{1}{2}$ , and therefore would have entered the second lunar asterism, Śatabhishá: a line drawn from the point in which the sun is thus situated through the centre, would fall into the lunar asterism Maghá, in which the moon was full, on the opposite side, and consequently, on the principle stated, the solar month was from thence called Mágha in the form of a patronymic. At the next full, the moon would be in Uttara Phalguní, and the solar month from thence called Phálguna; and on this principle all the months of the year were named.

“Hence it is very easy to demonstrate the utmost possible antiquity of the time when the months were, or could be, so named: for there are certain limits beyond which the line cannot be drawn: and these are the termination of the lunar mansion and the commencement of the solar month which determines the time, because it points out the commencement of the solar

month in respect of the fixed stars at the time. Thus, at the time of the above observations, the summer solstitial point was found in the middle of the lunar asterism Áśleshá, and the solar month S'rávana then began; for in the ancient astronomy of the Hindus, that month always began at the summer solstice. Now the month S'rávana derives its name from the lunar asterism S'ravaná (the twenty-seventh), then in the opposite part of the heavens. Let, therefore, a line be drawn from the solstitial point, or commencement of the month, cutting the centre, and it will fall into the very end of the lunar asterism S'ravaná, from which it derives its name S'rávana; which line is, therefore, at its utmost limit, as it cannot go farther without falling into a mansion of a very different name. This position of the line, therefore, proves that the months received their names at the time of the above observations, and not before. For if we wish to make it more ancient, let the solstitial point be supposed more advanced in respect of the fixed stars, say one, two, or three degrees, then a line drawn from the solstitial point, or commencement of the month S'rávana, cannot fall into any part of the lunar asterism S'ravaná, from which it derives its name, but into S'ravishtá (the first). Therefore the name which it possesses could never be given to it till the solstitial point, and commencement of the month, actually coincided with the middle of the lunar asterism Áśleshá (the fourteenth), being the same with the observation which refers us to the year 1181 B. C., and this is the utmost antiquity of the formation and naming of the Hindu months."

I have recalled these speculations of Bentley and others, partly because they show considerable ingenuity and open some questions which have not yet been solved by either scholars or astronomers; partly because I wished to convince my critics that if I do not always enter into all the controverted points, the theories, guesses, doubts, assertions, and counter-assertions of various scholars, it is not because I shrink from the trouble of examining them, (much of what is here printed was written twelve years ago,) but because I believe it is our duty, as Frederick the Great\* said, to learn to distinguish between what is important and what is not. We only retard the discovery of truth by entering into every by-path on the right and on the left. The straight line is always the best, the simplest machinery the most perfect. If we can prove our point without a great apparatus of so-called learning, it is our duty to do so. He sweeps cleanest that makes the least dust.

\* Oeuvres, vol. I. p. 264.

*Are the Indian Nakshatras of native or foreign origin?*

Another controversy, most seriously affecting, not only the age of Vedic poetry, but the whole history of the growth of the Indian mind in those remote ages, has been revived of late with so much vigour and acrimony, that, though it has hardly yielded a single new result, it cannot here be passed over in silence. The question is, whether one of the simplest and fundamental notions of Indian astronomy, the division of the heavens into twenty-seven equal parts, commonly called the twenty-seven Nakshatras or Rikshas, was indigenous to India, or borrowed from without. As one allusion to these Nakshatras occurs in the hymns of the Rig-veda, and as the twenty-seven divisions, with their asterisms and presiding deities, are known in the Bráhmaṇas, the principal charm of Vedic antiquities, namely, its independent originality, would be destroyed, if it could be proved that even at that early time, the rays of a foreign civilisation had influenced the growth of the Indian mind. If so important a subject as the division of the heavens into twenty-seven sections, a division which is at the root of their sacred calendar, and without which none of the sacrifices enjoined in the Bráhmaṇas could be conceived, was borrowed from without, what security would there be that the gods worshipped at the sacrifices, and the hymns repeated at the annual festivals were not borrowed from the same quarter? If at first the movements of the sun, the moon, and the stars suggested the *fasti* or festivals of the ancient world, the regulation of these festivals soon gave rise to a more accurate study of the periodical returns of the heavenly luminaries; and what we call the ancient calendars is but the result of this mutual action and reaction of astronomy and religion. And if that quarter from which the ancient Indian astronomy is supposed to have been borrowed was China, would not all our received ideas on the earliest history of mankind be upset? Would not the national individuality of the Aryan race be tainted in its core, and the Turanian man rise superior to his Aryan and Semitic brothers? Where so much is at stake, it would be wrong to trust to convictions, however firmly rooted; and when the arguments proceed from one of the most eminent men of our age, and are repeated by him, after a lapse of twenty years, with increased warmth and vigour, it is necessary to meet argument by argument, however strong our feeling that the conflict arose from a mere misunderstanding, and ought never to have taken place.

*Biot*, one of the most eminent among living,—I may now add,—one of the most eminent among departed astronomers\*, published a number of articles in the *Journal des Savants* in the years 1839, 1840, 1845, and again in 1859, 1860, and 1861, in which he endeavoured to prove the Chinese origin of the Indian *Nakshatras*. He maintained that the number of the *Nakshatras* was originally twenty-eight, and afterwards reduced to twenty-seven; that originally they did not represent the twenty-seven equal divisions of the Indian ecliptic; that they had no connection with the course of the moon, but were single stars, near the equator, the intervals of which in time had been carefully determined, in order to refer to them the positions of other stars and planets coming to the meridian between them.

Such was the authority which of right belonged to the opinions of so great an astronomer as *Biot*, and such the learning and ingenuity with which he defended his propositions, that Professor Lassen allowed himself to be swayed by *Biot's* arguments, and, in his '*Indian Antiquities*,' admitted the introduction of the Chinese *Sieu* into Northern India before the fourteenth century B. C. I quote from the first volume of his excellent work, page 747: "As a primitive intercourse between Hindus and Chinese, never suspected before, is now firmly established, and as the latter employed their *Sieu* at a much earlier period, it is impossible to use the Chinese origin of the *Nakshatras* as an argument against their employment by the Hindus at the time of their own most ancient and still preserved astronomical observations. These observations belong to the fourteenth century B. C., and it follows from them that the Hindus were at that time settled in the north of India."

These early observations, however, which were supposed to point to the fourteenth century, presupposed, as we said, the employment of twenty-seven *Nakshatras*, (otherwise the solstitial points there mentioned would be at unequal distances from each other,) whereas, according to *Biot's* own statements, the number of the Chinese *Sieu* was only twenty-four, and was not raised to the number of twenty-eight till the year 1100 B. C. This difficulty did not escape so careful a scholar as Professor Lassen. He admits (p. 745) that the Hindus could not have received the division of the heavens into twenty-eight sections before 1100 B. C.; but, in order to save the early observations of the fourteenth century, he adds (p. 746), that though the complete number of

\* S.-B. *Biot* died the 3rd of February, 1862, eighty-eight years of age.



the twenty-eight Nakshatras was not known in India before that date, their use may have been transmitted there at an earlier period.

I doubt whether even the authority of a Lassen was strong enough to give currency to Biot's theory among Sanskrit scholars; but it soon became apparent that historians and philosophers were attracted by its novelty, and used it as an important help for determining the mutual relations of the principal races of the East at the very dawn of history. The late Mr. Hardwick, in his learned and thoughtful work, '*An Historical Inquiry into some of the chief Parallelisms and Contrasts between Christianity and the Religious Systems of the Ancient World*,' 1855-58, had the following remarks on the supposed intellectual intercourse between China and India:

"Before the name of the Middle Kingdom had been ever uttered in the learned halls and avenues of the Athenian Academy; before the eagle of the Roman legions, thirsting after universal sway, had tried its earliest flight across the Central Appennines; before the English of that ancient world, the colonising merchants of Phœnicia, had unfurled their sails upon the waves of the Atlantic, and trafficked in the precious metals on the coasts of Albion and Ierne; large communities of settlers, stretching far across the plateau of Upper Asia, were already living under the patriarchal rule of great and powerful princes. Chinese ports were even then frequented by adventurous traders from Ceylon, from India, from the Persian Gulf. A knowledge of Chinese astronomy found its way beyond the mountains, and took root in Northern Hindustan."—Pp. 7, 8.

In a review of this work, which I published in 1858, I felt it necessary to protest strongly against treating the Chinese origin of the Indian Nakshatras as a recognised fact, and thus disturbing, without sufficient evidence, the early history of Eastern civilisation. I may be allowed to give a short extract from my Review:

"Now, in stating that a knowledge of Chinese astronomy found its way at that early period beyond the mountains, and took root in Northern Hindustan, Mr. Hardwick has the authority of Professor Lassen on his side, or rather that of M. Biot, whose views on this subject were adopted by Professor Lassen. But did Mr. Hardwick consider what is involved in such an admission, and how violently the true relation of these two ancient races, the Aryans in India and the Chinese in the Middle Kingdom, would be disturbed if this admission was

well founded? Astronomy—at least that part of it to which Mr. Hardwick more particularly refers, the *Nakshatras*, or the twenty-seven lunar mansions of the Brahmins—is most intimately connected with the religious worship of the Veda. No Hindu sacrifice could have been properly performed without a knowledge of the lunar mansions; no month could have received its present appellation without names being first given to those constellations from which the months derived their titles. Now, Mr. Hardwick would never admit that a Chinese or Turanian race could have exercised any very definite influence on the faith and worship of the Aryan settlers of India, and he would scout the idea of tracing Sanskrit words back to Chinese monosyllabic terms. Yet, if a knowledge of Chinese astronomy found its way across the mountains, and took root in Northern Hindustan, the event must have taken place at a very early period, previous at least to the composition of the Vedic hymns. The *Nakshatras* are mentioned in the ancient songs of the Veda. Thus, we read, Rv. I. 50, 2:—‘Like thieves, the *Nakshatras* (the stars) depart every night, before the sun who illuminates every thing.’ Here it might be said, that *Nakshatra* signified stars in general, and not the twenty-seven constellations rendered important by the passage of the moon. But it is in connexion with the moon, and therefore with an allusion to an equally-divided lunar zodiac, that the *Nakshatras* are mentioned in the Veda. ‘Soma, or the moon,’ it is said, in a hymn of the tenth Maṇḍala (X, 85, 2), ‘is placed in the lap of the *Nakshatras*.’ The moon is called the month-maker, *māsakrid*, in the first book of the Rīg-veda, at least according to one of the ancient commentators; and one of the principal sacrifices, mentioned in the ceremonial portion of the Veda, is that of the Full and New moon. The exact time of these lunar festivals is fixed with such minute accuracy, that the Hindus, at the time when these public sacrifices were established, or at least when they were regulated by the sacred institutions of the Brāhmaṇas, must have been considerably advanced in astronomy; and the base of their ancient astronomy was the zodiac of the lunar *Nakshatras*.

“The gradual growth of astronomical knowledge in India is intimately connected with the whole intellectual and religious history of that country. The primitive division of the year into lunar months must have taken place previously to the first separation of the Aryan family, for the name for moon and month is the same in the dialects of nearly all of its members. The

proper names of the months, however, are peculiarly Indian. They exist in Sanskrit only, but not in Greek or Latin. Now these Indian names of the months were derived from the names of the Nakshatras, and the names of the Nakshatras again were derived in several instances from the names of ancient Vedic deities\*. If, therefore, we find the same names of the months in Sanskrit and Chinese, and if these names are inexplicable in the Chinese dictionary, surely the conclusion is evident, that they were borrowed by the Chinese from the Hindus, and not by the Hindus from the Chinese. The three winter months are called in Chinese, *Pehoua*, *Mokué*, and *Pholkuna*; names which Dupuis† has compared with the three Indian months, *Paushya*, *Māgha*, and *Phālguna*. These Indian months had received their names according to a definite system, from the corresponding Nakshatras, *Pushyā*, *Maghā*, and *Phālgunī*. Shall we suppose, then, that the Hindus borrowed the idea of the lunar Nakshatras from the Chinese, but that the Chinese borrowed their names from the Hindus? In order to defend such a supposition, it would be necessary to establish the antiquity and genuineness of the early literature and civilisation of China on a much firmer basis than that on which it rests at present.

“Mr. Hardwick, who is at other times so sceptical about the early dates which Oriental nations claim for their literature, seems to have lent too willing an ear to the assertions of the Chinese scholars. It is true, that many of the most distinguished ‘Sinologues’ speak with perfect confidence of Chinese dates, going back as far as three and four thousand years B. C. Such dates occur in the original chronicles of the Chinese, and they are given there as if they had been written down at the time by imperial historiographers and astronomers. But has their value ever been tested by the same critical tests which have reduced the mythical chronology of Greece and Rome to such small dimensions? In Roman history, the destruction of the city and the burning of the Capitol are generally considered fatal to the genuineness of any dates previous to those events. Now, in Chinese history one of the most indisputable facts is, that between 480 and 206 B. C., that is to say, after that period of Chinese literature which is marked by the labours of Confucius and

\* Prof. Whitney points out the Vedic character of the deities, *Sūrya-siddh.* p. 203. The important point is, that some of them are *exclusively* Vedic.

† *Mémoire explicatif du Zodiaque*, par Dupuis,

Paris, 1806, p. 15. I cannot ascribe much importance to this argument until these barbarous names mentioned by Dupuis have been authenticated by Chinese scholars.

his collections of the ancient oral traditions of the country, China was devastated by revolutions and civil wars. In 213 B. C., the famous emperor *Tsin-chi-hoang* ordered all books to be burnt, except those treating on medicine, astrology, agriculture, and his own family annals. The punishment of death was threatened and inflicted on those who should venture to conceal books; and all Chinese authorities agree, that, during the years 213 to 206, this literary crusade had proved completely successful. In 206 a new dynasty, that of the *Hans*, came to the throne, and every effort was made by them to collect—and again, for the most part, from oral tradition—the remains of Chinese literature. But whatever the Chinese may relate of the miraculous escape of some of their old classics, and however plausible the arguments may sound by which Chinese scholars have defended the general fact of the high antiquity of Chinese civilisation, it would have been difficult to recover from oral tradition minute astronomical observations. M. Biot feels this himself; and he tries, very ingeniously, to save ‘a little of ancient astronomy.’ Speaking of the emperor *Tsin-chi-hoang*, he says, ‘Il ordonna, sous peine de mort, de brûler tous les livres, à l’exception de ceux qui traitaient de médecine, d’astrologie (conséquemment un peu d’astronomie)\*.’ This language shows sufficiently what the claims of the Chinese to genuine and accurate astronomical observations, fixing the days and hours of historical events, about 4000 B. C., really are; and we cannot bring ourselves to admit that, either in language, religion, or science, the relation of the early Aryans to the Turanian inhabitants of China was that of pupils to their teachers. On the contrary, we believe that the relation of India to China has always been the same which we find at the time when Buddhism was introduced into the Middle Kingdom; and we know of no fact, even in later times, which would lead us to suppose that China had ever repaid to India the debt which it owed to that ancient cradle of Eastern civilisation. If this relation of the two countries is once established and well kept in mind, it would require stronger evidence than

\* A still stronger admission has been pointed out by Prof. Weber (p. 300) from Gaubil (*Observ. II.* 3 seq.). Gaubil says that according to the unanimous testimony of Chinese astronomers, astronomy had been almost entirely neglected after the time of the Tchun-tsieou, edited by Confucius (died 480 B. C.). Eclipses were no longer observed, their calculations were no longer handed to the emperor, the tower of the mathematicians was but seldom ascended,

and the science and practice of the astronomical calculus became gradually lost. When the emperor Tsin-chi-hoang ordered the great burning of books, Gaubil continues, “supposé qu’il y eut des livres où il se trouvât des observations célestes et de préceptes d’astronomie, on les perdit : . . . . il ne restoit que des traditions confuses, des catalogues d’étoiles et de constellations et des fragmens de quelques livres cachés.”

the hypothesis even of so learned an astronomer as M. Biot, or the admission of so careful a Sanskrit scholar as Professor Lassen, to induce us on a sudden to invert the relative position of China and India, and to admit a civilising influence, exercised by the former on the latter. Such exceptions occur, no doubt, now and then in the ancient history of religion and civilisation, as well as in the ancient history of language. But, a general rule once being established, the exceptions require very strong evidence before they can be admitted: No one would allow an ancient Sanskrit word to be derived from Greek. But if words of decidedly Greek character have found their way into the Sanskrit dictionary, it becomes more necessary than ever to determine their relative ages: and we shall find that, in every instance, those Greek words, such as the words connected with the solar zodiac, are of a very late date in Sanskrit; in fact, not anterior to the well-established historical intercourse between India and Greece after the time of Alexander.

“ We have dwelt rather long on this single question about the Chinese origin of Hindu astronomy; but it will be seen, we hope, that, though it seems to be an isolated fact, it involves important consequences with regard to the organic structure, if we may say so, of the whole ancient civilisation of the East. We do not blame Mr. Hardwick for having been swayed by the authority of such men as Biot and Lassen; but we thought it right to point out how, in travelling over the unexplored and unmapped regions of the ancient world, he might have guarded himself against ever missing the right direction, if, instead of trusting to partial guides, he had clearly impressed on his own mind the great watersheds of thought and language which divide the principal families of the human race. Mr. Hardwick mistakes the place where the currents of Chinese and Indian civilisation effect their first junction.”

Shortly after these remarks were published, Biot renewed the controversy about the Chinese origin of the Indian Nakshatras, and he succeeded by his learning and by his eloquence to win the approval of at least one more Sanskrit scholar, but one eminently qualified to express an opinion on such a subject, I mean Professor Whitney, the editor of the Atharva-veda, and of the important astronomical manual, the Sūrya-siddhānta. In his Notes on the Sūrya-siddhānta the Professor gives a most careful analysis of all the information that could be collected on the Indian Nakshatras, the Chinese Sieu, and the Arabic Manzil. He determines the situation of the stars and groups of stars which, under their Sanskrit, Chinese, and Arabic names, are referred to by the

astronomers of the East, and he arrives at the conclusion, that "after the exhibition of the concordances existing among the three systems, it can enter into the mind of no one to doubt that all have a common origin, and are but different forms of one and the same system." (P. 201.)

He then enters on an examination of Biot's hypothesis, according to which the Indian Nakshatras are derived from the Chinese *Sieu*. "According to Biot," he writes\*, "the *Sieu* form an organic and integral part of that system by which the Chinese, from an almost immemorial antiquity, have been accustomed to make their careful and industrious observations of celestial phenomena. Their instruments, and their methods of observation, have been closely analogous with those in use among modern astronomers in the West: they have employed a meridian-circle and a measure of time, the clepsydra, and have observed meridian-transits, obtaining right ascensions and declinations of the bodies observed. To reduce the errors of their imperfect time-keepers, they long ago selected certain stars near the equator, of which they determined with great care the intervals in time, and to these they referred the positions of stars or planets coming to the meridian between them. The stars thus chosen are the *Sieu*. Twenty-four of them were fixed upon more than two thousand years before our era, &c." (Pp. 201—203.)

After expressing his entire concurrence in the views of Biot, Professor Whitney proposes nevertheless another theory, according to which the knowledge of Chinese astronomy was not imported straight from China to India, but (p. 205) "was carried, together with the Chinese system of division of the heavens into twenty-eight mansions, into Western Asia, at a period not much

\* *Sûrya-siddhânta*, edited by Burgess and Whitney, p. 201 seq. I add the last statement which Biot has left of his views on the Chinese *Sieu*: "Je vais signaler à l'avance le but unique vers lequel nous allons marcher. Il est tout entier compris dans la proposition suivante, que je me borne à reproduire d'après les énoncés que j'en ai plusieurs fois donnés dans ce journal même: Le trait distinctif de l'astronomie des Chinois, c'est l'observation assidue des astres quand ils passent au méridien, en notant, au moyen des horloges d'eau, les instants où ils se trouvent dans ce plan. Vingt-huit étoiles, réparties sur le contour du ciel, et toujours les mêmes, leur servent comme autant de

signaux fixes, auxquels ils rapportent les positions relatives des astres ainsi observés. De cette seule pratique, invariablement suivie depuis un temps immémorial, ils ont su déduire par eux-mêmes les durées moyennes des révolutions du soleil, de la lune, et des planètes; les périodes de temps qui ramènent ces astres en conjonction ou en opposition entre eux; les éléments d'un calendrier lunaire suffisant à tous les besoins publics; et aussi une ample provision, incessamment renouvelée, de pronostics astrologiques, ce besoin primitif et universel de l'esprit humain." *Journal des Savants*, 1861, (p. 9.)

later than B.C. 1100, and was then adopted by some western people, either Semitic or Iranian. In their hands it received a new form, such as adapted it to a ruder and less scientific method of observation, the limiting stars of the mansions being converted into zodiacal groups or constellations, and in some instances altered in position, so as to be brought nearer to the general planetary path of the ecliptic. In this changed form, having become a means of roughly determining and describing the places and movements of the planets, it passed into the keeping of the Hindus—very probably along with the first knowledge of the planets themselves—and entered upon an independent career of history in India. It still maintained itself in its old seat, leaving its traces later in the Bundeshesh; and made its way so far westward as finally to become known to, and adopted by, the Arabs.”

Though I had hoped that some one better qualified than myself would vindicate the Indian origin of the ancient Indian astronomy, and though I consider Professor Whitney, who, to an extensive acquaintance with astronomy adds a scholar-like knowledge of Sanskrit, an antagonist even more formidable than Biot, yet, as I protested against the conclusions of the one, I feel bound to oppose the arguments of the other. I do not see that we gain any thing by assuming an indirect instead of a direct importation of Chinese wisdom into India, particularly if the intermediate stage seems to have no other object than to bring the scientific discoveries of the Chinese down to the level of the Indian understanding. Nor do I see that we fare better if, as Professor Weber \* proposes, we admit a spreading of astronomical knowledge from a Semitic centre, and assume the fundamental notions of chrononomy to have been imported from Babylon to China on one side, and to India on the other. I differ *toto cælo*

\* Die Vedischen Nachrichten von den Naxatra ; erster Theil, 1860 ; zweiter Theil, 1862. These Essays are very creditable to the author, and hardly deserved the withering contempt with which they were treated by Biot, (Précis de l'Histoire de l'Astronomie Chinoise, p. 9.) I differ from nearly all the conclusions at which Prof. Weber arrives, but I admire his great diligence in collecting the necessary evidence. It is not necessary, however, to enter on a discussion of all the problems touched upon by the learned author, and I have tried to confine myself as much as possible to the main issues of this already but too complicated controversy. What vitiates many of Prof. Weber's arguments is that

he has not made it clear to himself in every instance whether the months he is speaking about are sidereal or synodical. Their relation to the fixed stars (Nakshatras) and to the seasons would be much affected by this difference. At Rome, in spite of intercalary months, January, at the time of Cæsar, occupied the season of the year which ought to have been occupied by October. (Sir C. Lewis, Survey of Ancient Astronomy, p. 237.) Much greater confusion must have existed in ancient India, where the standard measure of time was simply nycthemeric, modified on certain occasions by lunar, solar, or sidereal time.

from every one of these theories. I feel as strongly to-day as I did when, in the year 1846, I read at Paris the articles then published by Biot, that the Brahmans cannot have borrowed the idea of the Nakshatras from the Chinese. I maintain, 1. that the Nakshatras were suggested to the Hindus by the moon's sidereal revolution; 2. that they were intended to mark certain *equal* divisions of the heavens; and 3. that their number was originally twenty-seven, not twenty-eight.

Though the custom of beginning a discussion with verbal definitions has got into disrepute, I think it best to adhere to the old rule; nay, I believe that its observance would have shortened, if it had not prevented, this long controversy. What then is meant by Nakshatra? Nakshatra has three principal meanings. Originally it meant stars in general; secondly, it meant the twenty-seven equal divisions of the heavens, constantly referred to in the Bráhmaṇas and Sūtras; and thirdly, it meant the twenty-eight asterisms, consisting of either one or more stars, which in later scientific treatises served as "*points de depart*" for astronomical observations. In order to avoid confusion I shall in future use Nakshatra in the second sense only, translating it by lunar mansions, while I use Tárá instead of Nakshatra, if employed in the third sense, translating it by asterism.

The coincidences between the Indian and Chinese systems of astronomy which struck Biot, and which before him had struck Anquetil and Bentley, refer entirely to the Indian Tárás and the Chinese Sieu. I can understand how an astronomer who for the first time perceives these coincidences, should be strongly inclined to waive all minor differences and assume that the conceptions shared in common by Indian and Chinese astronomers were derived by the Indians from the Chinese, or by the Chinese from the Indians, or by both from a common source. But now that the novelty of the discovery has well nigh passed away, a more sober examination of the case would seem to lead to different results. I cannot agree with Prof. Weber when, in the beginning of his Essay, he asserts that "the thorough analogy or even identity of both systems necessitate the admission of a special relationship." The Sieu were originally twenty-four in number, they were afterwards raised to twenty-eight. There is no trace of a similar change in India. The Sieu throughout are single stars\*; the Tárás are, for the most part, groups or clusters of stars.

\* Whitney, p. 207.



The system of single stars, Yoga-tárás or junction-stars, is of so decidedly modern a date that Prof. Whitney places its introduction in the sixth century of our era (p. 212). But as to the coincidences themselves, taking it for granted that the Sieu stars are in all cases rightly identified with the stars of our globes, it should be borne in mind, that the identification of the Hindu Tárás is in many cases extremely problematical. Al-Biruni, who, in the eleventh century, attempted for the first time to authenticate the Indian Tárás, relates that the Indian astronomers were unable to point out the stars to him. He was obliged to leave seven or eight as unknown or doubtful\*. Sir W. Jones and Colebrooke, who, in more recent times, undertook the same task, complained of the same difficulty. But even in the astronomical works of the Hindus there is some discordance as regards the stated position of the junction-stars of the asterisms†, and with regard to the number of stars comprised in each asterism the opinions vary even more considerably‡. But if we waive all these objections, nay, if we allow a still further latitude, and count all Sieus and Tárás as identical whenever the Sieu star corresponds with any one star of the Hindu asterisms, what is the result§? Out of twenty-eight Sieus there are seventeen which can be identified with the Tárás. Now, if a scientific system is borrowed, it is borrowed as a whole. When the Hindus borrowed the twelve zodiacal signs, they did not borrow one-half of them only, but the whole. Unless therefore the discordance of nearly one-half of the Hindu and Chinese asterisms can be satisfactorily accounted for, I, for my part, must confess that I do not see so startling a problem that requires to be solved. If certain stars suggested themselves as particularly useful to the Chinese astronomers, some of them, not all, might have recommended themselves for the same reason to the Hindus. Under the supposition that the Hindus were the pupils of the Chinese, the coincidences arising from this cause would be far less startling to me than the differences. On a point like this, however, I shall be inclined to defer to the authority of astronomers, and I am quite prepared to find that sooner or later the differences between the Sieus and Tárás may be accounted for. What then? Every Sanskrit scholar will most readily surrender the whole system of the Tárás and Yoga-tárás, or junction-stars, whether twenty-seven or twenty-eight in number,

\* Whitney, p. 181; *Journal des Sav.* 1845, pp. 39-54.

† Whitney, p. 182.

‡ Weber, p. 380 seq.

§ Whitney, p. 200.

as of foreign origin. It never occurs in the ancient literature of the Brahmans, it is not mingled with any of their ancient rites or traditions. It comes in at a time when India was no longer shut out from the rest of the world, and when a scientific study of astronomy had succeeded to the homely rules of the Vedic priests. That the system of the *Súrya-siddhánta* points to Greek and Alexandrian models has been proved by Prof. Whitney, and before him, by Colebrooke. Let us hear what Colebrooke said on this subject\* :

“ The Hindus had undoubtedly made some progress at an early period in the astronomy cultivated by them for the regulation of time. Their calendar, both civil and religious, was governed chiefly, not exclusively, by the moon and the sun : and the motions of these luminaries were carefully observed by them, and with such success, that their determination of the moon’s synodical revolution, which was what they were principally concerned with, is a much more correct one than the Greeks ever achieved. They had a division of the ecliptic into twenty-seven and twenty-eight (?) parts, suggested evidently by the moon’s period in days, and seemingly their own : it was certainly borrowed by the Arabians. Being led to the observation of the fixed stars, they obtained a knowledge of the positions of the most remarkable ; and noticed, for religious purposes, and from superstitious notions, the heliacal rising, with other phenomena of a few.

“ Whatever may have been the period when the notion was first obtained, that foreknowledge of events on earth might be gained by observations of planets and stars, and by astronomical computation, or wherever that fancy took its rise, certain it is, that the Hindus have received and welcomed communications from other nations on topics of astrology : and although they had astrological divinations of their own as early as the days of *Parásara* and *Garga*, centuries before the Christian era (?), there are yet grounds to presume that communications subsequently passed to them on the like subject, either from the Greeks, or from the same common source (perhaps that of the Chaldeans) whence the Greeks derived the grosser superstitions engrafted in their own genuine and ancient astrology, which was meteorological.

“ Joining this indication to that of the division of the zodiac into twelve signs, represented by the same figures of animals, and named by words of the same import with the zodiacal signs of the Greeks ; and taking into consider-

\* *Miscellaneous Essays*, II. 447.

ation the analogy, though not identity, of the Ptolemaic system, or rather that of Hipparchus, and the Indian one of excentric deferents and epicycles, which in both serve to account for the irregularities of the planets, or at least to compute them, no doubt can be entertained that the Hindus received hints from the astronomical schools of the Greeks."

At the time at which Professor Whitney places the selection of the junction-stars to represent the asterisms, namely, in the sixth century of our era, there were Chinese travelling in India, and Hindus settled in China. An Indian religion had been imported into China, Indian festivals were celebrated in that country, and an Indian calendar had to be accommodated to that of the Chinese. At that time it was not only possible, but necessary that some compromise should be effected between the astronomical grammars of the two nations; and I have little doubt that the distinguished scholar whose works have thrown so much light on the intellectual and religious intercourse between China and India in the seventh century A.D., will be able to solve the problem, how it was that some of the Chinese determinative stars were identified with the Tárás or Yoga-tárás of the Hindus, and a twenty-eighth asterism added to the twenty-seven heretofore in use. If the Chinese had been acquainted with India at the early period implied in Biot's theory, would it not be extraordinary that the name of India should never occur in their ancient annals? It is commonly admitted that India was unknown to the Chinese before the expedition of Tchang Khian, 126 B. C., and its usual name, Thian-tchu (Sindhu), is in the Chinese annals mentioned for the first time in the eighth year of the emperor Ming-ti, 65 B.C.\* The name of "China" has commonly been supposed to imply a date. If it is derived from the dynasty of the Tsin which came to the throne in the year 246 B.C., then no work in which "China" occurs as the name of the country, could be older than the third century B.C. I confess that I feel very unwilling to give up this view, and the fact that the name of China occurs in the so-called Code of Manu and in the Mahábhárata, so far from invalidating the date of the name, would only tend to confirm the modern origin now assigned to these works by all critical Sanskrit scholars. The difficulty is that "erez Síním" occurs in Isaiah xlix. 12, and that the passage in which it occurs is considered by unprejudiced scholars as beyond any reasonable doubt more ancient than the third century B.C. It has been pointed out therefore, that the dynasty of the

\* Foe Koue Ki, p. 14.

Tsin, before its accession to the imperial throne, had been reigning for 600 years in the province of Tsin (now Shensi), in that part of China which was the most likely to be first visited by travellers either from India or from Babylon. This would entail the loss of a most useful date, but it would help on the other hand to establish the possibility of Chinese astronomy being carried to Babylon, or Babylonian astronomy to China, at an early period, at least at the time when the second half of Isaiah was written\*.

Leaving the problem, if problem it can be called, as to the coincidences between certain of the Chinese Sieu and certain of the Hindu Tárás, to be settled by scholars and astronomers who take an interest in the medieval history of India and China, we now approach a second question, namely, whether it is possible to identify the Chinese Sieu with the Hindu Nakshatras or twenty-seven lunar mansions. Bentley declared decidedly that such an attempt was useless. "With respect to the lunar mansions of the Chinese," he writes, "they differ entirely from those of the Hindus, who invariably make theirs to contain  $13^{\circ} 20'$  each on the ecliptic; whereas the Chinese have theirs of various extents, from upwards of  $30^{\circ}$  to a few minutes, and marked by a star at the beginning of each, which makes them totally differ from the Hindu." With the more accurate knowledge of the Sieu, which we owe to Biot, the difference between the two has become still greater, and instead of wasting any more time on attempts to compare the two, and trace them back to some common origin, we have only to describe the original character of the Nakshatras, in order to show how from beginning to end they differ from the Chinese Sieu.

First then, the twenty-seven Nakshatras were suggested by the moon's passage. But though suggested by it, they were by no means confined to the one object of determining the moon's position in the heavens. Nothing was more natural for the sake of counting days, months, and seasons, than to observe the twenty-seven places which the moon occupied in her passage from any point of the sky back to the same point. It was far easier than to determine the sun's position either from day to day, or from month to month, for the stars being hardly visible at the rising and setting of the sun, the idea of the sun's conjunction with certain stars could not suggest itself to a listless observer†. The moon progressing from night to night, and coming successively in contact with certain

\* Cf Gesenius, ed. Dietrich, s. v. *sínfm*.

for when the sun rises, one cannot see the Nakshatra."

† Thus it is said in the Taitt. Br. I. 5, 2, 1:

"Let him determine the Nakshatra about dawn;

stars, was like the finger of a clock moving round a circle and coming in contact with one figure after another. Nor would the portion of about one-third of a lunation in addition to the twenty-seven from new moon to new moon, create much confusion in the minds of the rough and ready reckoners of those early times. All they were concerned with were the twenty-seven celestial stations which, after being once traced out by the moon, were fixed like so many mile stones for determining the course of all the celestial travellers that could be of any interest for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years. Any circle divided into twenty-seven sections, or any twenty-seven poles planted in a circle at equal distances round a house, would answer the purpose of a primitive observatory. All that was wanted to be known was between which pair of poles the moon or the sun were visible at their rising or setting, the observer occupying the same central position on every day. Our notions of astronomy cannot be too crude and imperfect if we wish to understand the first beginnings in the reckoning of days, and seasons, and years, and I doubt whether a profound knowledge of modern astronomy is not more of an impediment than help to the historian of the early days of astronomical discovery. We cannot expect in those days more than what a shepherd would know at present of the sun, and moon, and stars, and seasons. We cannot expect any observation of heavenly phenomena unless they had some bearing on the practical wants of primitive society, and if we meet with any records of these we must not expect them in that scientific form in which they are said to have been recorded in China, but rather in the forms of mythes and legends, the only language possible in those days of intellectual awakening. Thus we find the earliest allusion to the connection between the moon and the twenty-seven Nakshatras, in a legend preserved in several of the Bráhmaṇas. We read in the Káthaka, ii. 3 \*:

“Prajápati gave his daughters, the Nakshatras, to King Soma (the moon). He dwelt with Rohiṇí. Those who were not visited by him, went back; (therefore does a wife, if she is not visited, go back.) He followed them, he asked for them again. He (Prajápati) did not give them back. He said, Dwell equally with all, then will I give them back. He dwelt with Rohiṇí only. Therefore consumption seized him upon this falsehood. (The King Soma is the moon, and as consumption seized the King, this is the origin of the so-called Royal Consumption.) He withered like grass. He prayed to Prajápati. He said,

\* Weber, Ind. Stud. III. p. 467.

Dwell equally with all, then will I deliver thee of this. Therefore does the moon dwell equally with all the Nakshatras."

It is unfortunate that the number of the daughters of Prajāpati is not given in this passage, but it is nevertheless important as establishing the fact on which I insisted, namely, that the Nakshatras represented originally a division of the heavens into so many equal parts, and that this division was suggested by the course of the moon.

In another passage where the same legend is told (Taitt. Sanh. II. 3, 5, 1) the number of the daughters of Prajāpati is stated as thirty-three\*, which may possibly be explained by the fact that in the ancient lists six of the Nakshatras are spoken of in the dual†. In the later literature, however, in the Mahābhārata, Manu, the Vishṇu-Purāṇa, where the same or similar legends are related, the number of the daughters of Prajāpati or Daksha‡ is given as twenty-seven.

But we need not depend on these legends only in order to convince ourselves of the intimate connection between the twenty-seven Nakshatras and the moon. The sidereal, or, as it is sometimes called, the periodical month, i. e. the time during which the moon makes a revolution from any Nakshatra back to the same, though it was not used by later writers for astronomical or historical purposes, is nevertheless described by Garga and others on account of its importance for sacrificial purposes. I give the following extract from Garga which occurs in the commentary on the Jyotisha (MS. E. I. H. 1510. p. 6):

तथा च गर्गः ।

यावता त्वेव कालेन भवर्गे त्रिणवात्मकं ।

भुङ्क्त इदं: स आक्षो मास्तस्यार्द्धं पक्ष उच्यते ॥

यतश्चत्वारि मानानि तानि तु गर्गवाक्ये दर्शयिष्यामि ॥ तद्यथा ॥

सावनं चापि सौर्यं च चांद्रं नाक्षत्रमेव च ।

चत्वार्येतानि मानानि तैर्युगं प्रविभज्यते ॥१॥

\* The Triṇava (27) and Trayastrīṇa (33) Stoma are mentioned together, Vāj. Sanh. XIII. 58.

† These are 6, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21; all the rest are spoken of either in the singular or in the plural. The commentary to Taitt. Sanh. II. 3, 5 (just re-

ceived in Prof. Cowell's valuable edition) explains the number by counting the Kṛittikās as seven, and the other Nakshatras each as one.

‡ See Boehtlingk-Roth, Dictionary, s.v. Daksha; Weber, Nakshatra, p. 277.

अहोरात्रात्मकं लौक्यं<sup>१</sup> मानं च सावनं स्मृतं ।  
 अतश्चैतानि मानानि प्रकृतानीह<sup>२</sup> सावनात् ॥२॥  
 ततः सिद्धान्यहोरात्रायुदयाश्चाप्यथार्कजाः ।  
 त्रिंशच्चाष्टादशशतं १८३० दिनानां च युगे स्मृतं ॥३॥  
 मासस्त्रिंश ३० दहोरात्रः<sup>३</sup> पक्षोऽर्द्धं १५ सावनं स्मृतं ।  
 अहोरात्रं लवानां तु चतुर्विंशच्छता २४०० त्मकं ॥४॥  
 सौर्यं सूर्यावु संभूतं परिसर्पति भास्करे ।  
 यावद्युत्तरां काष्ठां स<sup>४</sup> गत्वा गच्छति दक्षिणां ॥५॥  
 कालेन सोऽष्टस्तस्यार्द्धमयनं तु त्रयोऽर्तवः<sup>५</sup> ।  
 चतुर्द्विंश भवेन्मासं त्रिंशद्भागं दिनोऽर्कजः ॥६॥  
 तस्यार्द्धमर्कजः पक्षस्तस्मात्पंचदशं दिनं ।  
 शतं लवानां षड्विंशं<sup>६</sup> लवाः पंचदशस्तथा ॥७॥  
 त्रिंशच्चाष्टादशशतं युगमार्कैर्दिनैः स्मृतं ॥८॥  
 वृद्धिक्षयाभ्यां संभूतं चांद्रं मानं<sup>७</sup> हि चंद्रतः ।  
 लवं लवमथानेन सावनेन निशाकरः ॥९॥  
 क्षयं वृद्धिमवाप्नोति स चांद्रो मास उच्यते ।  
 तस्यार्द्धं पार्वणः पक्षस्तस्मात्पंचदशी तिथिः ॥१०॥  
 प्रमाणेन लवानां तु द्वाविंशं शतमुच्यते ।  
 सोमस्याष्टदशशती युगे षष्ठ्यधिका स्मृता । १८६० ॥११॥  
 यावता त्वेव कालेन भवर्गे त्रिणवात्मकं ।  
 भुंक्त इंदुः स आर्क्षो मास्तस्यार्द्धं पक्ष उच्यते ॥१२॥  
 आर्क्षोऽप्यष्टात्पंचदशं नाक्षत्रं दिनमुच्यते ।  
 प्रमाणेन लवानां तु द्वाविंशं शतमुच्यते ॥१३॥  
 नाक्षा सप्त षष्ठ्युत्तरां<sup>८</sup> जनं चास्मात्परो लवः ।  
 दशोत्तरे द्वे सहस्रे युगमार्कैर्दिनैः स्मृतं ॥१४॥

<sup>१</sup> लौक्यं MS.<sup>२</sup> प्रवृत्तानि ?<sup>३</sup> त्राः MS.<sup>४</sup> स deest in MS.<sup>५</sup> योऽर्तवः MS.<sup>६</sup> षड्विंश MS.<sup>७</sup> मासं MS.<sup>८</sup> ष्यत्त MS.

“ And so says Garga,

‘ The time in which the moon enjoys the circle of the Nakshatras, consisting of twenty-seven, that is a Nakshatra month, and its half is called a paksha.’

“ For there are four measures of time, and I shall propound them in the words of Garga \*, viz. :—

‘ The libatory (sávana), the solar, the lunar, and the sidereal (nákshatra), these are the four measures, by them the lustrum (yuga) is divided.

‘ The measure consisting of day and night is called the vulgar and the libatory (sávana) †; and therefore these measures do here proceed from the libatory measure.

‘ After it the nycthemera are fixed, and their beginnings proceed from the sun; and a lustrum is said to consist of 1830 such days.

‘ The month consists of thirty nycthemera, and half of a sávana (month) is called a paksha. A nycthemeron consists of 2400 lavas ‡.

‘ The solar computation is derived from the sun while Bháskara (the sun) travelling round goes to the south, having first gone to the northern region.

‘ This is a year in time, its half, the Ayana, consists of three seasons; half of a season is a month, consisting of thirty parts; the day is made by the sun.

‘ Half of it is a solar paksha, and a day is the fifteenth part of it; this fifteenth part (one day) consists of 2600 lavas §.

‘ A lustrum (or yuga) is said to consist of 1830 solar days ||.

‘ The lunar measure is derived from the moon by its increase and wane. When the moon step by step, every libatory day, increases and wanes that

\* “ Of four modes, namely, solar, lunar, sidereal, and civil time, practical use is made among men.” Sūrya-siddhānta XIV. 2.

† It is called sávana from the three libations or sávanas, at morning, noon, and evening; it is the simplest conception of the day, extending always from sunrise to sunrise, without taking into account the different lengths of the year. Cf. Sūrya-siddhānta I. 36; XIV. 18: udayād udayam bhānoḥ sávanam tat prakīrtitam, sávanāni syur etena yaj-nakālavidhis tu taih.

‡ A lava would thus correspond to 36 seconds of our time. Wilson’s Dictionary gives a lava either as the 60th part of a nimesha, or as two káshthás, neither of which would correspond with

रात्रौ of a day and night.

1 day and night = 60 ghaṭikás (náḍi) = 24 minutes.

1 ghaṭiká = 60 kalás (pala, vināḍi) = 24 seconds.

1 kalá = 60 káshthás = 24”.

1 káshthá = 18 nimeshas.

1 nimesha = 30 tatparas.

1 tatpara = 100 trutiś.

Other divisions are given by Boehtlingk-Roth, s. v. truti. Prof. Weber takes चतुर्विंशत्तामके for one hundred and twenty-four.

§ There is some mistake in the MS., which will have to be corrected with the help of other MSS. The construction is that the 26th hundred of lavas is the 15th part of the paksha.

|| One line seems to be wanting.



is called a lunar month; half of it is a *pārvaṇa* paksha, and the fifteenth part a tithi.

‘ This (the tithi) is said to be 2200 lavas in measure, and in the lustrum of the moon there are said to be 1860 days\*.

‘ The time in which the moon enjoys the circle of the Nakshatras, consisting of twenty-seven, that is, a Nakshatra month, and its half is called a paksha.

‘ The fifteenth part of this Nakshatra paksha is called a Nakshatra day; this is said to be 3200 lavas in measure.

‘ A yuga is said to consist of 2010 Nakshatra days†.’”

Another account of the different computations of the year is given in the *Nirṇayasindhu*, written by Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa, and printed at Calcutta, 1833. There it is said, that “according to Mādhava’s opinion, five ways exist of calculating the year, and that there is a *sāvana*, *saura*, *chāndra*, *nákshatra*, and *bárhaspatya* year. The *Bárhaspatya* year is regulated by the planet Jupiter, and is known in astronomical works only. North of the Narmadá it may be used for ceremonial purposes. Hemádri says, that there are only three different years, because the two last are not employed in the *Dharmaśāstra* (law-books). Each year consists of twelve months, and if there be intercalary months, sixty days must be considered as one month, as Vyása said, ‘Sixty days are called a month by the *Bádarāyaṇas*.’ Five *Chāndra* or lunar years make a yuga, and each of the sixty years has its own name. The same names apply also to the *Bárhaspatya* years, which begin with the month of *Mágha* (winter solstice), while the *Chāndra* years begin with the bright half of *Chaitra* (vernal equinox). At sacrifices and on other solemn occasions the *Chāndra* or lunar year is to be used, and no other, as *Ārshṭishēṇa* says.

“ An *Ayana* (sun’s road, half year) consists of three solar seasons. There are two *Ayanas*, a southern and a northern one, the one beginning with *Karka* (Cancer), the other with *Makara* (Capricorn), and different sacrifices are to be performed, according to different authorities, either in the one or the other *Ayana*.

“ A season consists of two months, but here too an intercalary month is

\* अष्टादशशती must be taken as a feminine, a sum of eighteen hundred.

† The first line is not clear, and throughout the

whole extract both text and translation must be considered to rest on the authority of one MS. only.

not counted by itself. A month is of two kinds, lunar or solar. The first lunar month is Chaitra in Vasanta, the first solar month begins either with Mína (Pisces) or Mesha (Aries), as Baudháyaṇa says: ‘Vasanta (spring) is in Mína and Mesha, or in Mesha and Vṛisha (Taurus).’ For śrauta and smárta ceremonies the lunar seasons ought to be used, and, if this be impossible, the solar ones. There are six seasons, lunar as well as solar: Vasanta, Gríshma, Varsha, S’arad, Hemanta, and S’ísira.

“There are four kinds of months;

1. Sávana,      2. Saura,      3. Chándra,      4. Nákshatra.

1. The *sávana* month has thirty days and nights.

2. The *saura* month goes from one conjunction of the sun to the next one. The first is Vaiśákha in Mesha (Aries). Although there are two Darśas (days of new moon or conjunction) in Mesha, the first is reckoned as belonging to Mína (Pisces), and goes to the solar month Chaitra.

“Some ghaṭikás before and after the entrance of the sun into a new sign are considered as sacred :

1. In Mesha 10 ghaṭikás are sacred before and after the conjunction.
2. In Vṛisha 16 . . . . . before the conjunction.
3. In Mithuna 16 . . . . . after the conjunction.
4. In Karka 30 . . . . . before the conjunction (ayanam dakṣiṇam).
5. In Sinha 16 . . . . . before the conjunction.
6. In Kanyá 16 . . . . . after the conjunction.
7. In Tulá 10 . . . . . before and after the conjunction.
8. In Vṛiśchika (Annakí) 16 . . before the conjunction.
9. In Dhanus 16 . . . . . after the conjunction.
10. In Makara (Jhasha) 24 ghaṭikás are sacred after the conj. (ayanam udak).

(This is according to Hemádri’s opinion. Mádhava considers 20 ghaṭikás as sacred after the conjunction.)

11. In Kumbha 16 ghaṭikás are sacred before the conjunction.
12. In Mína 16 . . . . . after the conjunction.

The equinoxes fall in Mesha and Tulá.

The solstices in Karka and Makara.

3. The *chándra* month consists of two pakshas (halves of the moon). This lunar month either begins with S’ukla (the bright half) and ends with Amá (new moon), or it begins with Kṛishṇa (the dark half) and ends with full

moon. South of the Vindhya they begin the month with the moon's increase, but north of it either with its increase or with its decrease, though the former is the more usual. The first *chāndra* month is Chaitra.

4. The *nākshatra* month consists of one passage of the moon through all the Nakshatras\*.

"A Bráhmaṇa ends his month with the new moon (*Amávásya*), a Kshatriya with the sun's entrance (*Sankránti*) into a new sign, a Vaiśya with full moon. Garga says: 'The *saura* month is to be used at marriages &c., the *sāvana* month at sacrifices, the *chāndra* month at annual and obsequial rites. Other authorities however give different rules.'"

Having thus established the first point, that the twenty-seven Nakshatras were suggested by the periodical revolution of the moon, we proceed to consider the second, namely, that the twenty-seven Nakshatras represented so many *equal* divisions of the heavens. This was clearly indicated by the legend of Soma being ordered to dwell the same time with every one of his wives, but it is likewise implied in almost every statement in which the Nakshatras are used for chronological purposes. No one in the present day would think of employing instead of the equal segments of the zodiac, the single stars of the Greek constellations, the Lion &c., for fixing the time of the year; nor would an Indian astronomer make use for that purpose of the single stars of the Nakshatras, instead of the twenty-seven equal divisions in which these stars are scattered about. Unless the Nakshatras meant the twenty-seven equal divisions, each consisting of  $13^{\circ} 20'$ , how could it be explained that the summer solstice falls in the middle of *Āślesha* when the winter solstice is in the beginning of *S'ravishṭhá*, thus giving thirteen and a half Nakshatras to the sun's road north and exactly the same number to its road south of the equator?

The passages generally quoted to prove the inequality of the Nakshatras† are all taken from modern books, and, as far as I can understand them, they refer to the *Tárás* or stars, not to the Nakshatras or lunar mansions. It is

\* Thus it is said in the Grammar of Pāṇini (IV. 2, 3), that certain adjectives are formed from the names of the Nakshatras, to express the time connected with them, i. e. the time during which the moon is in conjunction with any one of the Nakshatras. If therefore the passage of the moon through all the Nakshatras corresponds to one *nākshatra* month, its passage through each of the

Nakshatras would be a *nākshatra ahorātra* (day and night). This is said expressly by Patanjali: कः पुनः कालो नक्षत्रेण युज्यते । अहोरात्रः । The day and night therefore during which the moon passes through the Nakshatra *Pushya* in any month would be called *pausha*, *pausham ahar*, *paushí rátriḥ*.

† Cf. Weber, *Nakshatra*, p. 309 seq.

perfectly possible that, as Hindu astronomers maintain, the moon or the sun may be in conjunction with one of the stars belonging to the Tárás, before they have entered the Nakshatra-segment to which that Tárá has given its name. Nor would this in any way disprove the equal distances of the Nakshatras, for it is only in comparison with these equidistant Nakshatras that the stars or clusters of stars could possibly be called either deficient or excessive. If the coincidences between certain Tárás and certain Sieus are so startling as they are represented to be, they may possibly find their explanation in the intercourse between the Buddhists of India and China, which dates from a period anterior to the first occurrence of the non-equidistant Tárás in Sanskrit literature.

The only passage which for a moment made me doubtful as to the equal division of the Indian Nakshatras, is that quoted by Prof. Weber from a Hebrew translation of Majrīti (p. 323 seq.). Majrīti (died 1007 A. D.) speaks of the lunar mansions of the Hindus : he gives their names, twenty-eight in number, and their degrees on the ecliptic. These degrees, to judge from the translation supplied by Dr. Steinschneider, vary considerably. I therefore requested Dr. Neubauer to collate the original text of Majrīti, preserved in an Arabic MS. of the Bodleian Library, and I was glad to find that the apparent inequalities are due entirely to the Hebrew translation, the Arabic original allowing about  $12^{\circ} 51' 26''$  to each of the twenty-eight manzil \*. This therefore shows again an equal division, though it does show at the same time that the Arabs, in other respects the docile pupils of the Hindus, divided the heavens into twenty-eight, instead of twenty-seven, equal segments.

Finally, as to the number of the Nakshatras, I maintain that it was originally, and that, in one sense, it always remained twenty-seven. Let us first examine Biot's view of the subject. He maintains that the number of Nakshatras was originally twenty-eight, because such was the number of the Chinese Sieu; and that† “the omission of Abhijit from the series took place because the mansion belonging to that asterism was on the point of becoming extinguished, the circle of its junction-star being brought by the precession to a coincidence with that of the junction-star of the preceding asterism about A. D. 972.” Prof. Whitney has pointed out some mistakes which vitiate Biot's calculation, and

\* Majrīti begins : Now I shall mention the effects of the moon within the limits of their stations, as agreed upon by the Indians, &c. Dr. Steinschneider has lately supplied a more correct

list of the lunar mansions from a Leyden MS. in his learned essay on “Pseudepigraphic Literature,” p. 76.

† Whitney, Sūrya-siddhānta, p. 208.

which would defer till several centuries later the date of coincidence of the two circles of declination. He himself, however, believes, like Biot, that Abhijit is as originally and truly a part of the system of asterisms as any other constellation in the series, which is properly composed of twenty-eight members, and not of twenty-seven. "The analogy of the other systems," he says, "and the fact that treatises like the *Sūrya-siddhānta*, which reckon only twenty-seven divisions of the ecliptic, are yet obliged, in treating of the asterisms as constellations, to regard them as twenty-eight, are conclusive upon this point. The whole difficulty and source of discordance seem to lie in this,—how shall there, in any systematic method of division of the ecliptic, be found a place and a portion for a twenty-eighth asterism? The *Khanda-kaṭaka*, as cited by Albiruni, in making out, by a method which is altogether irrespective of the natural positions of the asterisms with reference to the zodiac, the accordance already referred to between their portions and the moon's daily motions, allots to Abhijit so much of the ecliptic as is equivalent to the mean motion of the moon during the part of a day by which her revolution exceeds twenty-seven days. Others allow it a share in the proper portions of the two neighbouring asterisms: thus the *Muhūrta-Mālā*, a late work, of date unknown to us, says, 'the last quarter of Uttara-Ashādhā and the first fifteenth of Śravaṇa together constitute Abhijit: it is so to be accounted when twenty-eight asterisms are reckoned; not otherwise.' Ordinarily, however, the division of the ecliptic into twenty-seven equal portions is made, and Abhijit is simply passed by in their distribution. After the introduction of the modern method of dividing the circle into degrees and minutes, this last way of settling the difficulty would obviously receive a powerful support and an increased currency, from the fact that a division by twenty-seven gave each portion an even number of minutes, 800, while a division by twenty-eight yielded the awkward and unmanageable quotient  $77\frac{1}{4}$ ."

In answer to Biot, who fixes the date of the suppression of Abhijit at A. D. 972, we may simply appeal to Albiruni. He wrote a book on India, and particularly on Indian astronomy, about fifty-seven years after the supposed disappearance of Abhijit. He had been in India for several years, learning Sanskrit, reading in the original the astronomical works of the Brahmans, and consulting living astronomers on the actual position of their stars, and asking their advice on any points of difficulty. Yet nothing can be more opposed to Biot's theory than the view which Albiruni takes of the *Nakshatras*:

"The origin of the lunar mansions," he says, "amongst the Hindus is

analogous to that of the zodiacal signs, for in reference to these mansions, the circle of the zodiac is divided into twenty-seven equal parts, each mansion comprising  $13^{\circ} 20'$ , or  $800'$ . The planets enter and leave them, moving through them in latitude to the north and south. The principle of this division in twenty-seven parts lies in the moon's moving over the whole circumference of the heaven in  $27\frac{1}{3}$  days, which needs correction. The number of twenty-eight, admitted by the Araḇs, has likewise its origin by counting from the first lunar phase in the west to the last in the east. They reckon as one of the mansions the falling Eagle ( $\alpha$  Lyræ, Abhijit), so that they get twenty-eight, which has been the reason why some of our Arabian astronomers and almanac writers have been mistaken, asserting that the Hindus also had twenty-eight Nakshatras, and that they suppressed one which was always covered by the rays of the sun. *But this is wrong, for originally there were only twenty-seven, and one has been added afterwards.*"

Nothing can be clearer than this; nothing more in accordance with all we know from other ancient sources on the same subject. Yet Biot sees in all this nothing but a proof of Albiruni's ignorance, and remains unshaken in his belief that Abhijit was one of the old Nakshatras, and disappeared in the year 972 A.D.

In answer to Professor Whitney, who though differing from Biot's arguments, agrees nevertheless with him on the original number of the twenty-eight Nakshatras and the later suppression of Abhijit, I beg to propose the following theory. We must, from the beginning, distinguish between two things, the Nakshatras as the twenty-seven equal portions of the heavens, and the Nakshatras or Tárás as independent asterisms. We have to do the same in Greece with the zodiacal portions and the zodiacal stars, and it is well known that the Greeks for a long time admitted only eleven constellations, though they always had the twelve equal divisions of the ecliptic\*. I hold then that the names given to stars

\* Letronne, Journal des Savants, 1839 (p. 528): "La sphère grecque est originale; la formation en a été successive; l'idée de la division zodiacale, étrangère à sa première constitution, y a été transportée après coup; mais les figures et les noms des signes sont d'invention grecque.—Des textes existent, qui attestent l'introduction successive dans la sphère grecque de trois au moins des figures zodiacales.—Belier et Sagittaire par Cleostraté de Tenedos. (6<sup>me</sup> siècle.) Plin. II. 6.—Avant Cleostraté

les asterismes n'étaient pas même au nombre de neuf; et bien qu'il n'y ait aucune preuve que l'introduction de la Balance ne soit pas due à Hipparque lui-même, il est constant que les premiers textes où l'emploi de ce signe est clairement énoncé, sont ceux de Geminus et de Varron, appartenant au milieu du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle.—On sait que Ptolémée dans son catalogue, conserve  $\chi\eta\lambda\alpha\iota$  pour la constellation ( $\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ ), et  $\zeta\upsilon\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$  pour le signe ( $\zeta\acute{\omega}\delta\iota\omicron\nu$  et  $\delta\omega\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\mu\acute{o}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ )."

or constellations, such as Kṛittiká &c., existed before the triseinadic division of the heavens became fixed; that the most interesting, though not always the most brilliant stars were selected to serve as exponents of the twenty-seven divisions; and that in this selection Abhijit was not comprised. Abhijit, however, being as its very name declares, a star of good omen, continued to be observed for sacrificial purposes, and was invoked between the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh constellations, between Uttāfa-Ashādhā and Śravaṇa, where its real position is to be found. This is clearly shown by a popular legend, repeated in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa I. 5, 2, 3 and 4: "There is a Nakshatra, Abhijit by name, above the Ashādhās\*, below Śronā. The gods and Asuras were fighting, the gods conquered under that Nakshatra. Because they conquered, therefore it is Abhijit, the conqueror. Him of whom one wishes that he should conquer an invincible enemy, one ought to stir up to fight under the Nakshatra Abhijit. He conquers even the invincible, and as if he (the enemy) were defeated by his own fault." When in later times the Hindus became acquainted with nations using twenty-eight instead of twenty-seven determining constellations, Abhijit would naturally be thought of in order to bring their own system in harmony with that of their neighbours, and Arabic astronomers, in particular, would naturally, though wrongly, as pointed out by Albiruni, adopt the theory, adopted by Biot, that the Hindus did not understand their own system, and that Abhijit had at all times formed an integral part of their elementary astronomy.

If with this view clearly before us we examine the earliest as well as the latest notices of the Nakshatras that can be found in the literature of the Hindus, many difficulties will disappear. The number of twenty-seven, though not to be found in the Chhandas or Mantra periods, is of frequent occurrence in the Brāhmaṇa period. Many passages containing the number of twenty-seven for the Nakshatras may be seen in Prof. Weber's Essay, and in the Dictionary of Boehtlingk and Roth. In the Taittirīya-Saṁhitā IV. 4, 10, 1-3, where all the names and the presiding deities of the Nakshatras are given, Abhijit is not men-

\* The commentator states that Abhijit occupies the fourth quarter of Uttarāshādhā, and the first quarter of Śravaṇa. There is nothing to show that Abhijit was a *new* Nakshatra; on the contrary, the Brāhmaṇa connects it with ancient legends, like all the other Nakshatras. The only reason why its position is given is because the other twenty-seven Nakshatras had been mentioned before in proper order, whereas Abhijit, not being comprised in that list, had to be referred to the two Nakshatra divisions with which it coincided.

tioned, nor is its name to be found in a similar list in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa I. 5, 1. It occurs for the first time in a second list of the Nakshatras, in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa III. 2, 1, 6; and it occurs there, what is important and not favourable to my theory, as the sixth asterism after Full moon. Nevertheless I cannot bring myself to believe that it here enjoys an equal rank with the other Nakshatras; or, if it does, it does so only because certain popular superstitions had attached themselves to this asterism, and because certain libations were offered to it at the same time as those destined for the twenty-seven Nakshatras. The passage from the Atharva-veda (XIX. 7, 1, 8, 1), so often quoted by Biot and others, is more decided, and certainly proves the connection of twenty-eight Nakshatras with twenty-eight days. But the Atharva-veda stands by itself, and its last books particularly contain very doubtful passages. Unsupported by the genuine literature of ancient India, nay, opposed by its almost unanimous testimony, the charms and nursery rhymes of the Atharva-veda can carry no weight.

That an attempt was made to foist in Abhijit as a Nakshatra in places where it was not intended to be, is shown in a curious way by the MSS. of the Jyotisha and its commentary. The names of the twenty-seven presiding deities are given in the Jyotisha in three S'lokas:

अग्निः प्रजापतिः सोमो रुद्रोऽदितिर्वृहस्पतिः ।  
 सर्पाश्च पितरश्चैव भगश्चैवार्यमापि च ॥ २५ ॥  
 सविता त्वष्टा वायुश्चेन्द्राग्नी मित्र एव च ।  
 इंद्रो निर्ऋतिरापो वै विश्वे देवास्तथैव च ॥ २६ ॥  
 विष्णुर्वसवो वरुणोऽज एकपातथैव च \* ।  
 अहिर्बुध्नस्तथा पूषाश्विनौ यम एव च † ॥ २७ ॥  
 नक्षत्रदेवता एता ‡ एताभिर्यज्ञकर्मणि ।  
 यजमानस्य शास्त्रज्ञैर्नाम नक्षत्रजं स्मृतं ॥ २८ ॥

When these verses are repeated in the MS. of the commentary, Brahmá, the presiding deity of Abhijit, is inserted before Vishṇu, as pointed out by Professor Lassen, in violation of all the rules of metre.

\* Comm. वरुणोऽहिर्बुध्नस्तथैव च.

† Comm. अज एकपातया. Afterwards प्रोष्ठपदयोर्विपर्ययः पाठदोषो वा ॥

‡ Comm. सेता.



The very name given to the Nakshatra zodiac, namely *Trīṇavachakra* \*, shows that the idea of twenty-seven was foremost in the mind of those who fixed that name †. At the time of *Amara* ‡ the word *nakshatra* was used almost synonymously with twenty-seven, and a necklace, consisting of twenty-seven pearls, was called *Nakshatra-mālā*, *Nakshatra-string*. In like manner the *Hemachandra-kosha*, when enumerating the *Nakshatras* (vv. 108–115), gives only twenty-seven names, and does not include *Abhijit*. •

Lastly, in astronomical works, the *Nakshatras*, if used as chronological elements, are always twenty-seven in number.

*Sākalya*, the reputed author of the *Sākalya-Saṁhitā*, when speaking of the supposed motion of the Seven Rishis, says, “their motion is eight minutes in a year;” and again, “moving in the North into different positions, the Rishis employ 2700 years in revolving through the assemblage of asterisms §.” This is possible only under the supposition that the number of asterisms is twenty-seven, not twenty-eight. For eight minutes a year would amount to 800 minutes in one hundred years. Now 800 minutes is equal to 13° 20′; this again is the twenty-seventh part of the ecliptic, and therefore the stars called the Seven Rishis would require 2700 years to pass through the twenty-seven asterisms or the whole of the ecliptic.

*Varāha Mihira* again, when speaking of the supposed movement of the Seven Rishis, states on the authority of *Garga*, that “when king *Yudhisṭhira* ruled the earth, the Rishis were in *Maghā*, and the period of the era of that king is 2526 years. The Rishis remain for a hundred years in each asterism, being connected with that particular *Nakshatra* to which, when it rises in the East, the line of their rising is directed ||. The same position of the Seven Rishis at the junction of the *Dvāpara* and *Kali-yuga* is confirmed by quotations from *Vṛiddha Garga* and *Kāśyapa* by the commentator *Bhaṭṭotpala*.

Now although this movement of the Seven Rishis is but imaginary, it was used for chronological purposes, and as the *Paurāṇic* tradition gives 1115 years as intervening between the beginning of the *Kali-yuga* and *Nanda*, the predecessor of *Chandragupta* (*Sandrokyptos*), the *Bhāgavat-purāṇa* says quite in

\* See also *Taitt. Saṁh.* VII. 1, 2, 2.

† Cf. *Boehtlingk-Roth*, s. v. *trīṇava*, where *Trīṇavachakra* is not given.

‡ Cf. *Amara-kosha*, 2, 6, 2, 8. *nakshatramālā syāt*

*saptaviṁśatimauktikāih*. Cf. *Halāyudha* II. 408.

§ *Colebrooke*, *Miscellaneous Essays*, II. 358.

|| *Colebrooke*, *Miscellaneous Essays*, II. 356.

accordance with the theory of the movement of the Seven Rishis, that “when, from Maghá, they shall reach Púrváshádhá, then will this Kali age attain its growth under Nanda and his successors;” for as eleven Nakshatras pass from Maghá to Púrváshádhá,  $11 \times 100$  years must have passed between the beginning of the Kali age and Nanda.

A single allusion to Abhijit, as one of the chronological elements of the Brahmans, occurs in, a computation proposed by Lalla, as quoted by Muníśvara in his gloss on the Śiromaṇi (Colebrooke II. 358). Lalla says: “If the number of years of the Kali age, less fourteen, be divided by 100, the quotient, as the wise declare, shows the asterisms traversed by Marichi and the other celestial sages, beginning from the asterism of Viranchi (Brahmá).” Here Lalla is generally understood to mean the asterism Rohiṇi, which is sacred to Prajāpati (or Brahmá). But Muníśvara remarks in another place, that Lalla may here intend Abhijit, which is sacred to Vidhi or Brahmá.

But even then, what is the conclusion of Muníśvara? Not that the movement begins in the Nakshatra Abhijit, as one of twenty-eight Nakshatras, placed between Uttaráshádhá and Śravaṇa; but, on the contrary, that the movement would then begin in Śravaṇa, of which Abhijit forms a part, and that thus the statements of Lalla and Śákalya would be reconciled. Abhijit therefore, or Brahmá, would be simply a synonyme of Śravaṇa or of some part of Śravaṇa: it would not be one of twenty-eight equal divisions of the ecliptic.

I conclude with two extracts from the Sūrya-siddhānta\*. We read II. 64. भोगोऽष्टातीतिमाः, “the portion of an asterism is eight hundred minutes,” i. e. the twenty-seventh part of the ecliptic.

We find afterwards (l. c. p. 177) from VIII. 2 to 9, the position of each asterism in the arc of the ecliptic to which it gives name, and which is styled its “portion” (bhoga), the resulting polar longitudes and the polar latitudes. The stars of which the text thus accurately defines the positions, do not, in most cases, by themselves alone, constitute the asterisms; they are only the principal members of the several groups of stars,—each, in the calculation of conjunctions (yoga) between the planets and the asterisms, representing its group, and therefore called the junction-star, yoga-tára, of the asterism.

If therefore we find, as Professor Whitney writes, that in the former passage the ecliptic is divided into twenty-seven equal arcs, whereas in this passage we

\* Sūrya-siddhānta, ed. Whitney, p. 91.

are told of twenty-eight asterisms, very unequally distributed along the ecliptic, and at greatly varying distances from it, the natural conclusion is that the word nakshatra had two meanings, quite distinct from each other, as distinct in fact as Leo, when spoken of as a fixed star, and Leo, when spoken of as one of the duodecimal divisions of the sky, and that these must never be confounded.

The original meaning of Nakshatra\* was of course the natural, not the scientific. It meant first, star in general, afterwards, certain stars or portions of the starry heaven. In the Rig-veda, Nakshatra does not occur in its technical sense except in one passage, which I pointed out in my History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature (p. 212) †. This passage I communicated to Biot, who referred to it on several occasions. That I was right in speaking of it as the only allusion in the Rig-veda to the Nakshatras, in the technical sense of the word, is now admitted even by those who at first were sceptical on that point. Nor should I have ventured to suggest the technical meaning of Nakshatra even in this one passage of the Rig-veda, if it had not been that it occurred in the last Maṇḍala, which contains a mixture of very ancient and very modern fragments. I agree, however, with Professor Weber, that even in this passage there is no absolute necessity for taking Nakshatra in the sense of the twenty-seven Nakshatras, the stations of the moon. The word nakshatra may even here be rendered by star. But the probabilities are in favour of the translation which I first proposed. There are several allusions in the hymn to times and seasons ‡, nay, the only two names of particular Nakshatras which have been traced in the Rig-veda occur in this very hymn, Aghāḥ for Maghāḥ, and Arjunī for Phalgunī. The text, as repeated in the Atharva Sanhitā XIV.

\* I say nothing of the etymology of Nakshatra, because though many have been proposed by Indian and European scholars, there is not one that carries conviction, or does not violate some of the laws of Comparative Philology. The most unobjectionable derivation is that of Yāska, who derives nakshatra from naksh, 'to come,' 'to approach.' Naksh is used of the light of the sun filling the sky, Rv. X. 3, 5; and in a similar sense it occurs IV. 43, 5, and I. 95, 10. The idea of comers or goers is certainly not a very striking one, but the ancient poets actually used charishṇu, 'going,' as an epithet of nakshatra, Rv. X. 88, 13. See

Boehtlingk and Roth, s. v.

† Rv. X. 85, 2. अयो । नक्षत्राणां । एषां । उपस्थे । सोमः । आहितः, "then Soma, the moon, is placed in the lap of these Nakshatras."

‡ Verse 5. वायुः । सोमस्य । रक्षिता । समानां । मासः । आकृतिः । "Vāyu is the protector of Soma, the moon (month) is the type of the years." Why Vāyu is mentioned as protector of Soma is not clear. Rv. X. 21, 10, the Maruts are called nākshatraśāvas, but here nakshatra seems used in the sense of 'heaven,' and the compound would mean 'of heavenly strength.'

1, 13, leaves no doubt that the two Nakshatras Maghāḥ and Phalgunī are here intended.

सूर्यायाः । वहतुः । प्र । अगात् । सविता । यं । अवऽअसृजत् ।  
अघासु । हन्यते । गावः । अर्जुन्योः । परि । उह्यते ॥ १३ ॥

“ The dowry of Sūryā (sun, as feminine) went forth, which Savitṛi sent off. At the Aghās the cows are killed, at the Arjunīs she (the wife) is led round the fire.”

This is evidently intended simply as a symbolic sanction of some ancient customs, the marriage of the sun being the type of every human marriage. That the Arjunī stars were favourable for marriage ceremonies we can see from the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa I. 5, 1\*, where the first Phalgunīs are represented as flanked by a husband and wife, the second Phalgunīs by a dowry and those who carry it away from the father's house. It would be a mistake to think here of solar time, the time when the sun stands in Maghā and Phalgunī being considered in India as any thing but favourable for marriage ceremonies. If the expressions here used had any direct reference to a definite system of chronology, we could only take ‘at the Aghās’ and ‘at the Arjunīs’ in the sense of ‘at the Aghā and Arjunī full moons,’ and this would correspond with the month of Māgha or the winter solstice, the beginning of the year †, the time most auspicious for nuptial ceremonies. The killing of cows at marriage feasts may seem strange to those who are accustomed to modern Indian ideas, but the old Rishis had no scruples in killing the sacred animal. In the S’rauta-padma-nābhi (MS. p. 107<sup>b</sup>) a Sūtra is given गोपशुः कलौ निषिद्धः, “the cow as a sacrificial animal is prohibited in the Kali age,” which implies that in former ages no such prohibition existed.

In conclusion, I have to say a few words on an hypothesis according to which the discovery of the twenty-seven Nakshatras was originally made at Babylon, and from thence communicated at a very early time—the date is not given—to the Indians in the South, the Chinese in the East, and sundry Semitic nations in the West. Such an hypothesis seems almost beyond the reach

\* अयमर्थः पूर्वे फल्गुनी । जाया परस्ताद्वधोऽवस्तात् । भगव्योत्तरे । वहतवः परस्ताद्वहमाना अवस्तात् ॥ The commentator adds: पितृगृहात्कन्यया नीयमाना धनविशेषा वहतवः । तेषां वोढाये वहमानाः ॥

† तथा च लौगाक्षिः । माघ्याः पौर्णमास्याश्चतुरहः पुरस्तात्संवत्सराय दीक्षन्ते ।

of scientific criticism, though with the progress of the deciphering of the Babylonian Inscriptions, some facts may come to light either to confirm or to refute it. At present, however, all that can be brought forward in proof of such a theory is vague and uncertain, and could not stand the test of the most forbearing criticism, much less the attacks of that uncompromising scepticism which has lately been directed against all that is called ancient Babylonian astronomy.

It is certainly striking that the Arabic name of the lunar mansions; *manzil* (plur. *menazil*), should be derived from the same root as the *Mazzaloth* mentioned in the Bible. In the Second Book of Kings, xxiii. 5, we read how Josiah (624 B. C.) "put down the idolatrous priests, whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense in the high places in the cities of Judah, and in the places round about Jerusalem; them also that burned incense unto Baal, to the sun, and to the moon, and to the *planets*, and to all the host of heaven." The word here translated by *planets* is *Mazzaloth*. The LXX do not translate it, but render it by  $\mu\alpha\zeta\omicron\upsilon\rho\omega\theta$ , the Vulgate substitutes the zodiac; Rabbi Jona Ibn Djanáh suggests, as Dr. Neubauer informs me, the twenty-eight *manzil*. None of these translations rest on any tangible evidence, and all that can be said is, that the *Mazzaloth* *may* have been the lunar *Nakshatras*, but that we have no means of proving it. How dangerous it is to trust to mere plausibilities in matters involving such vast consequences, is shown by the word *Mazzaroth*, which occurs in Job xxxviii. 31, 32. "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion? Canst thou bring forth *Mazzaroth* in his season? or canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons?"

Here too *Mazzaroth* has been translated by the twelve signs of the zodiac; but as this is impossible, it was certainly tempting to take *Mazzaroth* as a dialectic variety of *Mazzaloth*, particularly as the expression of bringing forth the *Mazzaroth* in his season, seems so appropriate to the stars being, as it were, brought forth, and following each other in the succession of the seasons. Nevertheless, Professor Ewald declares such an identification as inadmissible, and is in favour of deriving the word from *nêzer*, 'crown,' as the name of a constellation.

The fact that the Harranians\* offered sacrifices to their god *Sín* (moon) every twenty-seventh or twenty-eighth day, proves nothing whatever as to the existence of twenty-seven *Nakshatras*.

\* Chwolsohn, *Ssabier*, II. 37, 256, 258, 295, quoted by Prof. Weber, *Nakshatras*, p. 316.

Lunar chronology seems everywhere to have preceded solar chronology. The Psalmist (civ. 19) sings\*, "He appointed the moon for seasons: the sun knoweth his going down;" and the Vedic Rishi (X. 85, 18) when speaking of sun and moon, says, "The one (sun) shines upon all creation, the other establishing the seasons is born anew." Ibn Esra observes in his Commentary on the Pentateuch (Exodus xii. 2) that the Hebrew word for month, *chodesh*, can be intended for lunar months only, because it is derived from a root meaning to be new, whereas *shanah*, year, would imply a solar year, because it expresses the idea of annus or annulus†. It is known besides, that at Jerusalem‡ the Syne-drium used to sit till two or three witnesses came to announce the first appearance of the new moon, and that the event was signalized all over the country by bonfires. And a similar custom prevailed among the Bâhîkas, where, according to the Mahâbhârata, an old witch sang out the new moon, beating a drum during the night, while the town of Sâkala was feasting§. I could mention fifty other passages where festivals are mentioned at the beginning, the middle, or the end of each lunar month, and I believe even that the Sabbath was originally a holiday connected with a lunar chronology||. But it serves no purpose to bring forward evidence which does not prove the point that has to be proved, and of which all that can be said is, that it is consistent with our theory.

More important are the passages where the *manzil* are mentioned in the Koran, X. 5, XXXVI. 39; nor can there be any doubt, after the evidence collected by Dr. Sprenger¶, that the twenty-eight lunar asterisms had been observed by the Beduins of the desert long before the time of Mohammed. Yet, after all that has been written on the subject, and I would particularly

\* Humboldt, *Kosmos*, II. 47. (Germ. Ed.)

† Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, p. 489.

‡ Cf. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, II. p. 344. Prof. Seyffarth endeavoured to show that the Jews, before the destruction of Jerusalem, used solar months only, but his arguments are not convincing.

§ Lassen, *De Pentapotamia*, p. 65, verse 25.

|| Dr. Neubauer has quoted a marginal note from the Cusari which is remarkable. It states that the hebdomadal chronology is found nowhere except where the Jews have introduced it: "J'ai trouvé une idée dans le livre de Salem ben Rou'heim; il fait observer que nous ne trouvons pas de nations

qui connaissent le sabbat (c'est-à-dire qui sachent le déterminer par le calcul), à moins qu'elles n'aient une notion de la Torah; par conséquent elles ont emprunté ce jour de repos aux Israélites; mais celles qui connaissent point la Torah, comme les Indiens et les Persans, &c., ne connaissent que les jours des mois d'après le calcul et d'après la tradition; mais elles ignorent la semaine sabbatique. Ces paroles sont citées au nom de Fayoumi." *Journal Asiatique*, Déc. 1861, p. 462.

¶ *Zeitschrift der D. M. G.* XIII. 160-165. Dr. Sprenger's remarks on page 161 are very important, and confirm the view which I have taken of primitive lunar astronomy.

call attention to Prof. Weber's careful reasonings on p. 320, I still hold to Colebrooke's view, who derives the Arabic manzil, at least in their scientific form, from an Indian source. Whatever view we may take on this point, the fact that Mohammed knew the twenty-eight lunar mansions, and that they were known to the Arabs before his time, could under no circumstances be used as an argument to show that they existed at Babylon in the twelfth century before our era, which is the point that would have to be established. The passage in the Bundelesh in which the twenty-eight divisions occur, is no more pertinent to the establishment of the Babylonian theory than the list of Coptic names\*, neither of them going back beyond the time of Mohammed. Why, finally, the latitude† to be discovered from the difference between the longest and shortest days which, according to the Jyotisha, amounted to six muhúrtas, or 288 minutes, should prove the Babylonian origin of Indian astronomy, I am at a loss to understand. Exact observations on such a point are out of the question in the absence of any exact time-pieces; a large margin therefore must be left in drawing any conclusions as to the latitude of the place in which such an observation could have been made. But the rivers of the Penjáb are in about the same latitude as the rivers of Mesopotamia; the observation in its crudest form could have been made in the Indian Penjáb quite as well as in the Babylonian Doáb; the whole argument therefore dwindles into nothing at the first touch of criticism. In spite of all, however, I am quite prepared to take into serious consideration the Babylonian origin of Indian, nay, even of Chinese astronomy, whenever the decipherers of the Cuneiform inscriptions shall have supplied us with evidence that deserves to be considered. No hypothesis, however repugnant to received notions, should on that ground be treated with contempt; but it would certainly be wiser to let certain questions remain in abeyance on which no new evidence has been forthcoming since they were last handled by sound and sober scholars.

I have thus, I believe, established what I wished to establish, namely, that the Nakshatras owed their origin and their successive growth to the Indian mind; that Nakshatra, meaning originally stars in general, was fixed upon as the word to be used, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, of the twenty-seven equal divisions of the starry sky, marked out by the periodical course of the moon; that they always

\* Weber, *Nakshatras*, pp. 326, 330.

of 4 h. 48 m. between the longest and the shortest

† Weber, *Nakshatras*, pp. 362, 400. A difference days would really correspond to lat.  $35^{\circ} 24'$ .

retained their original number and character when used for chronological purposes; but that in later times certain stars, twenty-eight in number, and vaguely corresponding with the twenty-seven ancient Nakshatras, were selected for the purpose chiefly of fixing the movements of the planets, but likewise for other astronomical and astrological purposes. How it came to pass that some of these Tárás and Yoga-tárás coincided with the Sieu of the Chinese, is a problem which will probably be solved when the history of Chinese literature has passed through the same critical ordeal which has destroyed so many illusions in Greece, Rome, and India. But, whatever that solution may be, it will never affect the springheads of the thought, of the language, and of the poetry of India, which rise from depths inaccessible to foreign tributaries, and whose earliest course we may follow step by step in the literature of the Brahmans with greater accuracy than is the case in the early history of any other nation.

The two points of which I have here treated at some length, namely, the value of the astronomical dates, and the origin of the Nakshatras, are by no means the only points on which objections have been raised tending to invalidate the views which I expressed in my History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature; but they are the most important, and they alone involved consequences compromising the antiquity and originality of the Rig-veda. If the astronomical data on which conclusions as to the age of the Veda have been built implied all they were represented to imply, the earliest periods of Vedic poetry would have to be rearranged. If it could be proved that China had exercised an influence on India, previous to the establishment of the Nakshatras, one of the principal charms of Vedic literature, its native originality, would be lost.

As to minor objections that have been started against some of the conclusions arrived at in my History of Sanskrit Literature, they must wait till more evidence has been brought forward which may tend either to modify or to confirm them. Many of these objections were not new to me, and had been carefully weighed before I wrote; others were groundless, and must have arisen either from want of clearness in the writer, or want of attention on the part of the reader. Thus when I maintained that, previous to Páṇini, no terms occurred which implied the existence of a written literature, of books, paper, pen or ink, I was perfectly aware that *kāṇḍa* was used in ancient works in the sense of a division of a literary composition, for instance,



in the Taittirīya-Saṁhitā, and in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. In fact I had mentioned kāṇḍas, kāṇḍikās, kāṇḍanukramaṇīs, &c., very frequently in my History. But how these words could prove the existence of books, i. e. of written books made of paper, I cannot see. Kāṇḍa means a section, a division, whether of a tree or of any thing else; it is almost synonymous with parvan and parichchheda. As I had shown that even such a word as grantha did not necessarily imply a written book, I thought I might safely pass by such terms as kāṇḍa, parvan, or parichchheda. Kāṇḍa never means a book, but always a section of a work, and there is no proof\* as yet that books in India were originally made of "the part of the trunk of a tree whence the branches proceed, a stalk or stem." I had myself expressed some doubts whether the word paṭala, which was said to mean originally the covering or bark of a tree, and which is used in the Rik-Prātiśākhya in the sense of chapter, might not point to books made of *liber*, the bark or rind of a tree. After Prof. Weber's remarks, however, on this word, as used in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa † (I. 21, 22; Aśv. S. IV. 6, 7), these doubts are nearly removed, it being most likely that the original meaning of paṭala was likewise section, division.

Another instance where my meaning has been misapprehended, and where I have been refuted‡ for opinions which I never held, occurred with regard to the dates of Yāska and Pāṇini. Because I said that on certain points Yāska holds more advanced views than Kātyāyana, it is argued that I *must* place Yāska after Kātyāyana and after Pāṇini. I see how the wording of one sentence in my book could have given rise to such a misunderstanding, but no attentive reader could have failed to see that I place Yāska before Kātyāyana, before Pāṇini, nay, even before S'aunaka. I believe I was the first to point out that Yāska, not Vaiyāska, was actually quoted in the Rik-Prātiśākhya, and as I still hold that this Prātiśākhya was anterior to Pāṇini, I could not have placed Yāska after Pāṇini.

It would be impossible to answer all objections of this kind, particularly

\* This view that kāṇḍa meant a book was advanced by Professor Theodore Goldstücker, in a most learned and painstaking review of my History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, which precedes his valuable facsimile of the Mānava-kalpa-sūtra. Some objections of the same scholar are answered in the next pages; others would require a fuller

examination than was compatible with the limits of this preface.

† The commentator says, paṭalaśabdah samūhāvācī; he also explains it by bhāgaḥ.

‡ Neither pūrvapakṣa nor uttarapakṣa could be correctly rendered by 'refutation,' in the sense in which that word is used by English writers.

when they are of a personal rather than a scientific character. Why I write *unādi* instead of *unnādi* would seem to be a matter of very small importance. That I know the rule of Pāṇini VIII. 3, 32, I have proved, I should think, in more than a thousand passages of my edition of the *Rig-veda*. But the phonetic rules are not applicable in their full strictness to the technical terms used by grammarians. Thus *अच्* means all vowels; gen. *अचः* (Pāp. I. 1, 57). Whenever *च्* becomes final, it ought to be changed into a guttural. Pāṇini does not so change it (I. 1, 10; 3, 2), nor have I ever met with the form *अगादि* or *अगंत*, which would be analogous to *उगादि*, but only with *अजादि* and *अजंत*, in apparent violation of Pāṇini's own rules. The same applies to *तिङंत*, which as a compound is generally spelt with one *ङ*, whereas, if it occurs by itself, followed by a vowel, the final *ङ* is doubled. Thus I have always printed *तिङुक्तिङः*, but *तिङंत*. The eighth class of verbs is commonly called *तनादि*\*, of which there is the derivation *तानादिक्* (Rv. Bh. I. 138, 2), both written with a single *n*. The fact is that in the real Sanskrit there is not a single instance† where in a compound the first pada ends in a nasal, which nasal is doubled; and hence there was no analogy to be followed in such artificial words as *उगादि*. Besides there is a natural reluctance to apply the rules of Sandhi to technical terms, the very meaning of which might sometimes be completely changed if the changes of Sandhi were observed. Taking all this into account, and being unable by the help of MSS. to satisfy myself as to whether Pāṇini's Sūtras gave *उगादि* or *उगादि* (the editions vary), I determined to retain the usual form, and I was strengthened in my determination by the fact that in metrical works too *उगादि* is used with the first syllable short‡.

With regard to one of the most important questions which have of late occupied Sanskrit scholars, namely, the Introduction of Writing, some new evidence, which deserves careful attention, has been brought to light by several of my critics, Professor Boehtlingk, Benfey, Whitney, Goldstücker§, and Westergaard. Not

\* The Calcutta edition has *तनादि* (P. II. 4, 79), which Boehtlingk alters to *तन्नादि*. Westergaard retains *तनादि*.

† The only instance which has been brought forward, *vrishapaśva*, is an exception to the rule, 'exceptio probat regulam.'

‡ Svaramanjari (MS. E. I. H. 98, p. 50<sup>a</sup>, l. 1):

संज्ञासु धातुरूपाणि प्रत्ययाश्च ततः परे ।

कायादिद्वयादनुबन्धमेतच्चास्त्रमुयादिषु ॥

§ A few points which can be settled without entering into details may here be touched upon in a note.

1. When I said that writing was not known before Pāṇini, I meant to imply that it became known in India about his time, but that the literature known to him, which had accumulated before his time, was oral only. I thus tried to account both for the absence of any allusion to written language

one of the facts, however, on which I based my argument, has been invalidated; on the contrary, the evidence has been strengthened, particularly by Professor

in his grammatical terminology, and for the appearance of grammatical terms implying a written language (*vindu &c.*) in later grammarians.

2. Lipikara, which I myself pointed out as occurring in Pāṇini, is never used for writer, still less for author; it means a man who makes lipis, i. e. public inscriptions. See Westergaard, *Abhandlungen*, p. 33.

3. With regard to the meaning of Yāvanānī lipi, a wide field is open to conjecture, because we have no means of exact knowledge. The two points, however, which I maintained, have never been shaken; namely, 1. that if Yāvanānī lipi means the Greek writing, it does not prove that Pāṇini was later than Alexander, because the Greek alphabet might well have been known in India before Alexander's conquest. This has been confirmed by Westergaard, *Abhandlungen*, p. 81; 2. that Yāvanānī lipi is most likely that variety of the Semitic alphabet which, previous to Alexander, and previous to Pāṇini, became the type of the Indian alphabet. (*Hist. of A. S. L.* p. 521.) The numerous changes of opinion of other scholars on this subject may be seen in the "Indische Studien," V. p. 8. Professor Weber does not yet seem to be aware that his efforts to prove that Yavana *may* mean Greek were not necessary. The important point was to prove that Yavana need not always mean Greek. This point was proved by Professor Lassen. But Professor Lassen, as well as most Sanskrit scholars, was fully aware that Yavana may mean Greek, before Professor Weber informed him of this fact. To determine *where* Yavana means Greek, and *where* it means Semitic nations, or even nations of black complexion, kālayavana, this is, and has been for some time, the real problem for Sanskrit scholars.

4. Ever since I have quoted Pāṇini for historical purposes, I have tried to distinguish between text and commentary, but as I have never based historical conclusions on words occurring in the commentary only, I have not distinguished between Patanjali, Kāśikā, &c. Professor Goldstücker

deserves great credit for having pointed out the necessity of such a distinction where the intellectual horizon of Patanjali has to be fixed. When I write "*in* Pāṇini," I mean the grammar such as we have it; when I say "*by* Pāṇini," I mean the man, the author of the Sūtras. Professor Goldstücker is right about Pāṇ. IV. 3, 108; I am glad, however, to find that I do not stand alone in my opinion of the traditional character of the udāharanās and pratyudāharanās. (See Westergaard, *Abhandlungen*, p. 66; and Prof. G.'s very pertinent remarks, p. 24, l. 21.) In other instances where Professor Goldstücker has suspected me of want of accuracy in quoting Pāṇini, he will find that there is a Cf. added to my quotations. Wherever this is the case, I wish the reader to compare Pāṇini, but give him to understand that Pāṇini, the author of the Sūtras, does not himself use the word in question. Thus, on page 369, the only quotation from Pāṇini with which Prof. G. finds fault, is marked with Cf. The same applies to p. 361, where I refer to Pāṇ. IV. 3, 101, and IV. 2, 64, in confirmation of the name by which Pāṇini's own work was familiarly known in later times. Here too Cf. is added. Thus again, Pāṇ. IV. 3, 108, is marked by Cf.; and the same caution is added to Pāṇ. IV. 2, 66 (p. 362), to Pāṇ. IV. 3, 102 (p. 371). The names mentioned on page 369 I did not intend to restrict to Pāṇini.

5. The fact that Sūtra in the singular means a complete work, confirms the opinion which I expressed, that it meant a string of rules, before it meant a single rule. The German "Band" does not mean a book in general, but a volume, originally a bound volume. The word was used in that sense since the middle of the eighteenth century (see Grimm, s. v.); and grammarians distinguish between der Band, die Bände, 'volume,' and das Band, die Bänder, 'string,' 'sūtra.'

6. The Sūtra which Kaiyaṣa marks as not composed by Pāṇini is IV. 3, 132, not IV. 3, 116. Sūtra IV. 3, 116, is merely marked as not explained in the commentary. See IV. 3, 106, ityādīni chaturdaśa sūtrāṇi bhāṣhye tu na vyākhyātāni. To

Westergaard. The conclusion which I draw from these facts, namely, that writing was never used for literary purposes in India before the time of Pāṇini, is certainly startling, and I have never disguised this. But I confess that the explanations which have been proposed by some of my critics, in order to save the character of an ancient written literature in India, seem to me too artificial, and based on historical theories rather than on historical facts.

I ought perhaps to add a few words on the delay which has occurred in the

this fact, that certain Sūtras are not explained in the Mahābhāṣya, I attach little importance, and quite agree with Professor Goldstücker's remarks. To any candid mind this subject is disposed of by Professor Aufrecht's remarks, *Catalogus Bodl.*, p. 160.

7. The passage from the Mahābhārata (Śāntip. v. 11339-11342) can only be understood of the weight of memory. No one would suspect Yudhiṣṭhira or any body else of being intent on carrying about a book; or if he felt the weight at all uncomfortable, he might easily debarrass himself of it. The weight of the Veda (vedabhāra) is spoken of in the Vasishṭha-smṛiti (*History of Anc. Sansk. Lit.* p. 55), where there can be no idea of heavy folios.

8. If varṇa means a modified sound, there ought to be, as Prof. G. says, something of which the varṇas are modifications. This is perfectly true. In the *Rik-Prātiśākhya*, XIII. 4, we read, "the breath being one, assumes in reality, as it becomes varṇa or letter, many sounds." As far as I understand Prof. G.'s further discussions on varṇa and kāra, they seem to prove to me simply this, that Pāṇini never uses kāra, and that he uses varṇa of vowels only. In Sūtra VII. 4, 53, I divide yīvarṇayoḥ into y (yakāra) and īvarṇa.

9. The expressions ūrdhva, udaya, &c., apply to memory even better than to books. Books might be turned topsyturvy, but in the memory the beginning of a book must always be bottommost.

10. Though I have never denied that Pāṇini may have been one of the first Brahmans acquainted with the art of writing, I did not think that this could be proved by the employment of accents in his Sūtras. The Svarita, which was intended to show that a rule extended its influence over certain other rules,

was actually pronounced, nor could a more convenient method have been imagined for distinguishing the head-words or head-rules than the prolonged intonation of the Svarita. It is nowhere said that these Svaritas were not pronounced, but only that they were not part and parcel of the rule (na tu prayogasamavāyī, lit. 'they do not enter into the effect produced by the rule').

11. As I always distinguish between the existence of an alphabet and its employment for literary purposes, I should be quite willing to admit that the shepherds at the time of Pāṇini marked their cattle with letters. The Greeks knew the alphabet, and used it for commercial purposes, for inscriptions, for public registers long before they dreamt of reducing their poems to writing. (See this point well argued by Mr. Grote in answer to the late Colonel Mure, Appendix I. and II. annexed to the third edition of Grote's *History of Greece*.) Numerical figures, totems, &c., are known to American tribes who have no alphabet. But I must confess that Pāṇ. VI. 3, 115, does not seem to prove to me convincingly the custom of using either letters or figures for branding cattle.

12. On the use of dṛiś in the sense of perceiving in general, see Boehtlingk-Roth, s. v. darś. The expression "na dṛiśyate" is synonymous with "na vidyate," "nāsti." In grammar, adarśanam is explained by aprayoga I, 2, 55; and prayoga, according to Prof. G., would mean pronunciation. See also the passage quoted from Yājñavalkya III. 191, and *Rig-ved-ābhāṣya*, vol. I. p. 30.

उत त्वः पश्यन्न ददर्श वाचमुत त्वः शृण्वन्न शृणोत्येनां,  
and the commentary,

एकः पुरुषः पाठमात्रपर्यवसितो वेदरूपां वाचं पश्यन्नपि  
न सम्यक् पश्यति ॥

publication of this volume of the Rig-veda. For a time it was doubtful whether the funds necessary for the completion of the Rig-veda would be provided. This caused uncertainty and delay. When I resumed my work, my time was no longer my own, and there were more urgent occupations which left me but scant leisure for the prosecution of my Sanskrit studies. Had I been allowed to devote, I do not say the whole, but at least one half of my time to the study of Sanskrit and the carrying on of my edition of the Rig-veda, the present volume no doubt would have been published long ago. Or, if I had been satisfied with printing the commentary of Sāyana such as it is given in the MSS. at our disposal, without attempting to verify the numerous quotations, to authenticate scattered allusions, to correct evident blunders of the copyists, and to supply omissions, as far as possible, from other sources, my task would have been a very easy one, and would have required far less of my time. But though a rapid reprint of a few MSS. has its advantages, and though I by no means share in the sweeping condemnation of the manner in which the text and commentary of another Veda have of late been edited, I feel that I should have ill requited the confidence of those who entrusted me with the *editio princeps* of the Rig-veda and of its commentary by Sāyana, if I had not done my best to make it as perfect as it could be made in the present state of Sanskrit scholarship, and with the materials now available. How many imperfections there remain in spite of my best endeavours, no one can feel more than myself. Though greater familiarity with the style of Sāyana has enabled me in the later books to remove the blunders of the copyists with more readiness and certainty than at the beginning, yet the MSS. of the later Ashtakas are much inferior to those of the first, and the number of passages hopelessly corrupt and imperfect is constantly increasing. The few Various Readings which I have printed give a very imperfect idea of the battles which an editor of Sāyana has to fight against the perverseness and carelessness of the scribes. Where the right reading could be restored with perfect certainty, little or nothing has been said in the Various Readings; but there is many a short line in these notes which represents the results of hours, nay, of days and weeks of hard work. Nor was one single passage surrendered as hopeless before every thing had been tried to render it correct.

I have stated on former occasions how much I owed to the assistance of my learned friend Professor Aufrecht, and I am glad to say that in the present

volume also I have to a considerable extent had the benefit of his cooperation. Though I regret his departure from Oxford, nothing could have been more beneficial to the interests of sound Sanskrit scholarship in this country than his appointment to the Chair of Sanskrit at Edinburgh, lately founded by Mr. J. Muir, D. C. L., the munificent patron of Sanskrit philology. Professor Aufrecht's transliteration of the text of the Rig-veda in Roman letters, now in course of publication, will be welcome to all students of Sanskrit. I look forward with confidence to many valuable contributions from his pen towards the elucidation of the Vedic language, Vedic mythology, and Vedic religion.

Another friend whose name I always had to mention in these pages with admiration and gratitude, H. H. Wilson, has not lived to see the completion of a work which owed so much to him. Without his strong recommendation it would have been impossible to secure the patronage of the Court of Directors of the late East-India Company, and afterwards of the Secretary of State for India; and some of the most valuable MSS. on which this edition is based, were procured through his influence. How deep an interest he took in this work he proved by undertaking the ungrateful task of preparing an English translation, a task which on other occasions "he intentionally left to younger and more enterprising study\*." Wilson had lived through almost the whole history of Sanskrit scholarship, and had taken part in nearly every important work that marked an epoch in the study of Indian literature, history, and religion. Every one of his own works represents a new conquest. He never followed, he was always first; and though he was sometimes blamed for want of accuracy, he might well appeal to the rough work which he had to do, while others followed in the paths which he had opened and smoothed. Where any useful work was to be done, where a dictionary had to be compiled, manuscripts to be catalogued, coins and inscriptions to be deciphered, where new texts had to be edited, new works to be translated, Wilson was always ready to undertake the task which no one else was willing or able to undertake, and he never undertook any thing without finishing it with unflinching perseverance. His was not the scholarship of a Colebrooke, a Burnouf, or a Lassen; but if we look at the works which he left behind, we shall see how much we owe to him, and how much we have lost in him. Though the scorn with which he spoke of those who had never ventured in translation beyond works that had been previously translated by

\* See the Preface to his edition of the *Daśa-kumāra-charita*, p. 31.

English scholars, and who were not even familiar with the native grammarians\*, provoked at the time angry rejoinders from Continental students, he lived long enough to see himself regarded as the revered Nestor by all who belong to the small but brave army of bonâ fide students of Sanskrit; and his memory will long be cherished in India as well as in Europe, as that of a real benefactor to India and to Indian literature.

I am glad to be able to announce that the translation of the Rig-veda which Wilson had undertaken, will not remain incomplete. He worked at it till nearly the last moments of his life, and Professor Ballantyne, his worthy successor in the Library of the India Office, has undertaken the task of editing his MS. What I think of Wilson's translation I have fully stated on various occasions, and particularly in the Preface to the third volume of this work. I consider a literal translation of the Veda, in strict adherence to the explanation of Sâyaṇa, as highly valuable and interesting, and I hope that that principle will be rigorously observed by the editor of the remaining portion of this translation. But though I regret that the opinions which I expressed on this subject were not approved by Professor Wilson, I cannot but repeat my firm conviction that if we may learn from Sâyaṇa how, after a lapse of thirty centuries, the ancient poems of the Rishis had been misunderstood by Indian theologians and philosophers, we must proceed in quite a different manner in order to learn how these simple hymns were originally understood by the Rishis themselves. This point has of late been so frequently discussed, that I will not here enter again upon it; but I hope within a short time to be able to lay before the public the first volume of a translation of the Rig-veda, based on those principles of interpretation on which nearly all who have worked in this new field of Sanskrit scholarship are fully agreed. A difference of opinion like this, though it may have caused pain to my departed friend and teacher, has never in the least detracted from the esteem and admiration which I shall always entertain for him. His loss I, more than any other, feel to be irreparable; but the true way to honour the memory of our departed generals is not to halt where they fell, but to advance to new conquests.

The vigour and enthusiasm with which the study both of the modern and of the ancient Sanskrit has of late been taken up, the continued activity of such

\* See his "Memorandum respecting Sanskrit Literature in England."

veterans as Bopp, Lassen, Benfey, Brockhaus, Stenzler, Westergaard, the original investigations of Aufrecht, Ballantyne, Boehtlingk, Foucaux, Goldstücker, Gorresio, Hall, Kuhn, Muir, Regnier, Röer, Roth, Schiefner, Weber, Whitney, the excellent work done in India both by Europeans, such as Cowell, Griffith, and Haug, and by a most important class of independent native scholars, such as Rádhákánta Deva, Íśvarachandra Vidyáságara, Bápú Deva, Krishṇamoḥana Banerjea, Nílakantha Gore, Rajendralala Mitra, Bháu Daji; lastly, the constant succession of new students, among whom the names of Bréal, Bühler, Fausböll, Haas, Kern, Pertsch, Siegfried, deserve to be distinguished—all these hold out a hope that the study of Sanskrit will not become stagnant, or lose the position which, thanks to the genius and honest industry of Sir W. Jones, Colebrooke, and Wilson, it has gained in our Universities by the side of Greek and Latin, of Hebrew and Arabic. The work which still remains to be done, however large its proportions, will not suffer from lack of labourers. At the present moment the most pressing work is, no doubt, the Veda, and new hands are wanted both for the edition of texts, not yet published, and for the critical interpretation of the relics of the ancient poetry of the Rishis. It is impossible for one scholar, it will probably be impossible for one generation of scholars, to bring the deciphering of the hymns of the Rig-veda to a satisfactory conclusion. My own contributions can for the future be but small, and very inadequate to the great difficulties that have to be overcome. With this volume, however, the most important portion of the Rig-veda is before the public. The ninth Maṇḍala contains nothing but the Soma hymns, the tenth and last offers a mixture of ancient and modern fragments. Every scholar is now able to take his share in the elucidation of the difficult language and the still more difficult thoughts of the ancient poets of India. Much has been done already, and a most important advance towards a right understanding of the Rig-veda will have been made when the Sanskrit Dictionary of Boehtlingk and Roth, published under the auspices of the Imperial Academy of St. Petersburg, and supported by the enlightened liberality of the Emperor of Russia, is finished. It is a work of which I feel it a duty to speak with the fullest acknowledgment of its great merits, because in this country its defects have been criticised with extreme rigour. Still further progress will be made when the Sanskrit Dictionary at which Professor Goldstücker has been working for many years is completed. But with all the light which the labours of these and



other scholars have shed on considerable portions of the Rig-veda, the dark and unintelligible passages have still a decided preponderance over those that have been made out to the satisfaction of impartial critics. Some portions of the Rig-veda, I confess, I consider as hopeless, and as likely to resist all attempts at interpretation. But there is no reason why we should despair. The Rig-veda is the most ancient book of the Aryan world. Every hymn, every verse, every word that can be deciphered in it is a gain. The sacred hymns of the Brahmans stand unparalleled in the literature of the whole world, and their preservation might well be called miraculous. We must be thankful that any authentic image of those primitive periods in the history of mankind which can now be studied in the Rig-veda, should have been handed down to us. These ancient hymns represent the lowest stratum in the growth of the human mind which can be reached anywhere by means of contemporaneous literature. And if in putting together the petrified remains of a primeval world, the geologist must often rest satisfied with fragments that tell but half of what they might have told, the historian also in gathering up the threads of the most primitive thoughts of man, must learn to make the best of rags and tatters that once formed part of the webs of poetry and religion woven by the early fathers of the human race.

MAX MÜLLER.

TENBY, October, 1862.

## ADDITIONAL NOTES.

I ADD a letter of Biot's on the Nakshatras, together with some interesting notes on some parts of my essay, which I owe to the kindness of Professor W. F. Donkin, and of the Rev. R. Main, Radcliffe Observer.

Biot's letter was written about two months before his death. It was addressed to Professor Benfey at Göttingen, and printed by him in his Journal, "Orient und Occident," vol. i. p. 747. It completes the evidence, as far as Biot's views are concerned. Although we learn from it that the eminent astronomer had slightly modified his opinion as to the exclusively Chinese origin of the Indian Nakshatras, it is impossible to accept his explanation of the original character of these asterisms, which would reduce the primitive elements of Indian astronomy and chronology to mere astrological contrivances.

"C'est moi qui me trouve très-honoré, et très-heureux, de la lettre que vous venez de m'écrire. J'en suis, on ne peut plus, reconnaissant. Dans tout le cours de ma longue carrière scientifique, je n'ai jamais eu en vue que la recherche de la vérité; et je ne m'en suis cru en possession, qu'après avoir vu les résultats de mes efforts sanctionnés par l'autorité des personnes qui en étaient les juges légitimes. Votre lettre me donne cette assurance pour le précis de l'histoire de l'astronomie chinoise qui m'a occupé toute cette année. C'est ma récompense. L'opinion des gens, peu ou mal informés, favorable ou défavorable, m'est complètement indifférente. Même, dans le premier cas, je dirais volontiers, comme Phocion à ses amis, après avoir prononcé un discours qui avait été fort applaudi par le peuple d'Athènes: est ce que j'aurais dit quelque sottise! Pour les travaux de l'intelligence, comme dans les décisions politiques, je ne fais aucun cas du suffrage universel.

"L'intérêt bienveillant que vous me témoignez m'enhardit à vous soumettre une idée, qui, si elle se trouvait justifiée par les épreuves que l'érudition pourrait lui faire subir, terminerait, à l'amiable, toutes les controverses aujourd'hui élevées, sur la nature et l'origine des Nakshatras primitifs des Hindous.

"Prenons d'abord le texte réputé le plus ancien où on les voit mentionnés. Dans un passage du Rig-véda, VIII. 3, 20, cité par M. Max Müller, il est dit:

*"Soma (la lune) est dans le sein de ces Nakshatras."*

"Comment ces Nakshatras primitifs étaient-ils constitués? C'est la première question qu'il faut se faire.

"Or je dis que ce n'étaient pas, que ce ne pouvaient pas être, des divisions du ciel, marquées par des étoiles prises sur la route mensuelle de la Lune. En effet, le plan de l'orbe lunaire n'est pas fixe dans le ciel. Il tourne continuellement autour de l'axe de l'écliptique, en conservant, sur le plan de ce cercle céleste une inclinaison moyenne d'environ 5°, qui éprouve de très-petites variations périodiques. Ainsi dans son mouvement révolutif, qui s'accomplit en 18 ans juliens et à peu près 7 mois et demi, il contient des étoiles sans cesse différentes, entre lesquelles, par conséquent, on ne peut pas établir des intervalles fixes, qui soient toujours situés sur la route changeante que la Lune parcourt mensuellement. Les chinois, qui rapportaient généralement les positions méridiennes des astres à 28 étoiles, toujours les mêmes, auraient pu, s'ils l'avaient

voulu, considérer les intervalles équatoriaux compris entr'elles, comme autant de *Mansions* passagères, appartenantes spécialement à la Lune. Mais les plus minutieuses recherches, faites à ce sujet, dans les textes originaux et les traditions, par M. Stanislas Julien et mon fils, ne leur ont pas découvert le moindre indice de cette pensée. Les Chinois considèrent leurs 28 sieou, comme les *demeures momentanées*, du soleil, de la Lune, des Planètes, des comètes, en un mot, de tous les astres qui se meuvent parmi les étoiles, sans les attribuer particulièrement à aucun d'eux.

“ Si les Nakshatras *primitifs* des Hindous, n'étaient pas des divisions stellaires prises sur la route mensuelle de la Lune on peut leur concevoir un autre mode de formation, qui aurait été bien plus simple, et plus naturel. Ce serait, qu'ils eussent désigné dans chaque lunaison, certaines époques, ou certains intervalles temporaires, auxquels on aurait attribué des influences favorables ou défavorables, comme S. Augustin nous apprend qu'on le faisait, de son tems, chez les Romains, et comme bien des gens le font encore de nos jours; n'osant pas se mettre en voyage, ou entreprendre certaines opérations agricoles, ou commencer un traitement médical, quand la Lune est en décroissance. Les Hindous n'auraient-ils pas, très-anciennement, sans aucune science, sans aucun échafaudage astronomique, attaché des pronostics de ce genre à chacun des 27 ou 28 jours de chaque mois, pendant lesquels la Lune nous est visible, ce qui aurait produit leurs 27 ou 28 Nakshatras? Ce ne sont là, sans doute, que des conjectures, mais si naturelles, qu'elles semblent mériter qu'on examine si les anciens textes Védiques n'en offraient pas quelque indication.

“ En supposant qu'elles se trouvassent ainsi justifiées le reste s'expliquerait de soi même. Quand les Brahmes ont voulu remplacer leur astronomie primitive par une science abstraite et mathématique, comme nous la voyons établie dans le *Súrya-siddhánta*, les 28 sieou chinois, régulièrement définis par leurs étoiles déterminatrices, leur offraient la matière, toute préparée, d'une substitution savante à faire aux Nakshatras primitifs: et, ne voulant les employer qu'à des applications astrologiques, ils purent, sans inconvénient, les adopter pour cet usage, contrairement à leur destination originaire; de même qu'ils ont dénaturé l'emploi des excentriques et des epicycles grecs, quand ils se les sont appropriés.

“ Si les choses se sont passées comme je viens de le dire, les Nakshatras primitifs des Hindous, et ceux du *Súrya-siddhánta*, seraient des institutions de nature et d'origine entièrement différentes, l'une indigène, l'autre étrangère; et tous les efforts d'érudition que l'on a faits, que l'on voudrait faire, pour dériver les nouveaux des anciens, seraient sans fondement, comme sans résultat. Mais dans tous les cas, ceux qui prétendraient établir cette dérivation, auraient pour obligation première, de nous faire connaître, d'après des documents positifs, en quoi les Nakshatras primitifs consistaient.

“ Je m'excuserais de vous avoir entretenu, avec tant de détails, d'une simple conjecture, si la question qu'elle concerne ne m'avait paru devoir vous intéresser, comme étant un des juges les plus compétents, et les mieux préparés, pour la décider.

“ En vous réitérant etc.

J. B. BIOT.

“ P. S. Si vous pensez qu'il y aurait quelque utilité à publier cette lettre, à cause du desideratum qu'on y signale, disposez en, comme vous le jugerez à propos \*.”

\* “Für die in diesem geistvollen Brief ausgesprochene Hypothese lässt sich vielleicht schon jetzt geltend machen: 1. Vájas. Samh. IX. 7, wo sieben und zwanzig Gandharva's erwähnt werden, welche der Schol. Ma-

hídhará gewiss mit Recht mit den Nakshatra's identificirt (man vergleiche damit Bhágav. Pur. IV. 29, 21, wo gesagt wird, dass die Gandharva's die Tage, die Gandharví's (Femin. von gandharva) die Nächte des

*Note of Professor Donkin on the Vedic Calendar* (page xxiv).

"The calendar at p. xxiv. professes to give the days of the month on which the solstices would fall during a cycle of five years, and also the moon's place at each solstice. It is supposed that the moon is in conjunction with the sun, and the sun in a solstice, at the beginning of the cycle; and that the same thing happens at the middle of the cycle. Hence it is easy to find the ratios which must have been assumed for the lunar months, both sidereal and synodical, to the solar year. Five solar years namely have been considered to be equal to 67 sidereal or 62 synodical months.

"According to the former of these assumptions the moon would make 6.7 sidereal revolutions in half a year; hence at the end of the half year it would be  $\frac{7}{10}$  of a revolution in advance of its place at the beginning. Now  $\frac{7}{10}$  of a revolution is ( $\frac{7}{10} \times 27 =$ ) 18.9 nakshatras. Hence if for every half year we add 18.9 nakshatras to the moon's longitude, and reject multiples of 27, we get its places as follows: (the names of the nakshatras are taken from the table in p. xxxiv.)

Time (in solar years).	Moon's longitude (in nakshatras).	Name of nakshatra in which the moon's place falls.
0	0	beginning of Śravishtā.
$\frac{1}{2}$	18.9	in Chitrā.
1	10.8	in Ārdrā.
$1\frac{1}{2}$	2.7	in Pūrva Bhādrapadā.
2	21.6	in Anurādhā.
$2\frac{1}{2}$	13.5	middle of Āśleshā.
3	5.4	in Āśvinī.
$3\frac{1}{2}$	24.3	in Pūrva Ashādhā.
4	16.2	in Uttara Phālgunī.
$4\frac{1}{2}$	8.1	in Rohinī.
5	0	beginning of Śravishtā.

"This agrees exactly with the calendar, and leaves no doubt as to the way in which the moon's places were calculated. But it does not settle the ratios of the month or year to the solar day. We find it stated, however, in the extract from Garga (pp. lv, lvi), that the lustrum is said to consist of 1830 solar days; and as this lustrum is evidently the period of five years, the year must have been assumed to contain 366 days, the lunar sidereal month  $27\frac{3}{4}$  days, and the synodical month  $29\frac{1}{4}$  days.

"All this is clear, and agrees with the statement that a yuga (or lustrum) contains 2010 nakshatra days, that is ( $29\frac{1}{4} \times 67 =$ ) 67 sidereal lunar months.

"But an apparent difficulty arises when we compare these results with the column in the calendar which gives the days of the month on which the solstices would fall. For since intercalations seem to be implied amounting to 60 days, the cycle would consist of 1860 days instead

Jahres sind), 2. die bekannten beiden Hymnen des Atharva-veda XIX. 7 und 8, von Regnier übersetzt in den 1859 in Journal des Savants erschienenen Artikeln (im besonderen Abdruck, p. 86, 87 Anm.). Diese Stellen sind jedoch verhältnissmässig jung. Im Rig-veda finde ich nakshatra *nur* in der Bedeutung 'Stern' (M. I. 50, 2. III. 54, 19. X. 68, 11), selbst als Bezeichnung der

'Sonne' (VII. 81, 2. X. 156, 4, und höchst wahrscheinlich auch VI. 67, 6), und ich glaube desshalb, dass *Max Müller* in der von ihm citirten Stelle (Asht. VIII. 3, 20 = M. X. 85, 2), eine Beziehung auf die Nakshatras im spätern Sinn mit Unrecht erblickt (History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 212 n.).—Anm. d. Red."

of 1830. The discrepancy will disappear, however, if we suppose the 1860 days to be, not solar days, but 'tithis,' of which 30 make a synodical month; for five years, being assumed to be equal to 62 synodical months, would contain 1860 tithis. And this also explains the statement (p. lvi) that 'in the lustrum of the moon there is said to be 1860 days,' which is unintelligible on the supposition that solar days are meant." (See the extract from Colebrooke, p. xix.)

---

Calculation of difference of epochs for observed precessional motion  $42^{\circ} 12'.30''$  of Regulus (from 1859), given in Archdeacon Pratt's investigation (page xxvii), by the Rev. R. Main, Radcliffe Observer.

"The general expression for the precessional motion reckoning from the year 1800, is

$50''.2401 t + 0''.0001134 t^2$ , when  $t$  is the number of years, and, reckoning from 1859, it is  $50''.2545 t + 0''.0001134 t^2$ , and this is equal to  $-42^{\circ}.12'.30'' = -151950''$ . As a first approximation neglect  $t^2$ . Hence  $50''.2545 t = -151950''$ , or  $t = -3024$  years. Substituting this in  $t^2$ , we get  $50.2545 t = -152987$ , or  $t = -3044$  years, which is equivalent to 1186 B. C."

(Archdeacon Pratt uses for mean annual precession  $50''$ , instead of  $49''.899$ .)

Making a similar calculation for Bentley's investigation (page xxx &c.), we have for 1750,  $50''.2298 t + 0''.0001134 t^2 = -158460''$ , whence, by exactly the same process,  $t = -3177$  years, which is equivalent to 1428 B. C.

AFTER this Preface was printed I received, through the kindness of the Rev. R. Main, the Radcliffe Observer, some extremely valuable calculations, which had been made, at his instance, by Mr. Hind. Though I never placed much confidence in Bentley's speculations, I certainly felt, as I said on page xxxii of my Preface, that "the coincidence pointed out by him between the modern names of the planets and the ancient astronomical facts to which they owe, or are supposed to owe, their origin, required an explanation at the hand of experienced astronomers." Much would depend on the correctness of Bentley's assertion that the occultations of the four planets by the moon took place within the space of about sixteen months, in the years 1424 and 1425 B.C., and that they took place respectively in those Nakshatras from which the names of the planets are derived. If Bentley's calculations should prove incorrect, his whole argument in favour of the date 1424 would at once be disposed of. But if they should turn out correct, then of two things one: either we should have to allow the reality of the observation and the reality of the date implied, or we should have to admit that the Brahmans, at the time at least of the Purāṇas, possessed sufficient knowledge of astronomy to be able to calculate correctly the longitudes and latitudes of the moon and of four of the planets according to the equinox of the year 1424 B.C. The one result would almost be as interesting as the other. I feel convinced, therefore, that all Sanskrit scholars will appreciate the important service rendered by Mr. Hind in undertaking the troublesome calculation, the results of which I am now able to lay before them:

Nautical Almanac Office, Nov. 21, 1862.

MY DEAR SIR,

I send you herewith the places of the moon and planets about the times indicated in your letter. Ecliptic conjunctions appear to have occurred in each case, but the differences of latitude show that, according to our best tables, Jupiter is the only planet that could have been occulted. The astronomical and not the chronological method of reckoning seems to have been adopted by Mr. Bentley, as you supposed.

Yours, &c.,

J. R. HIND.

The Rev. R. Main, M.A.

## LONGITUDE.

## LATITUDE.

		LONGITUDE.			LATITUDE.		
		☾	♀	♀—☾	☾	♀	♀—☾
— 1425	Aug. 18, h.	° /	° /	° /	° /	° /	° /
	0	69.12	97.28	+ 28.16	— 4. 5	+ 0.2	+ 4. 7
	12	76.21	98. 4	21.43	3.39	0.3	3.42
	19, 0	83.30	98.40	15.10	3. 8	0.5	3.13
	12	90.39	99.16	8.37	2.35	0.6	2.41
	20, 0	97.46	99.53	+ 2. 7	1.59	0.8	2. 7
	12	104.51	100.31	— 4.20	— 1.22	+ 0.9	+ 1.31

Venus therefore in Ecliptic ☾ with the Moon, about Aug. 20, 3<sup>h</sup> 56<sup>m</sup>, but differing from her in Latitude, + 1° 55′.

		LONGITUDE.			LATITUDE.		
		☾	♂	♂—☾	☾	♂	♂—☾
— 1424	April 16, h.	° /	° /	° /	° /	° /	° /
	0	12.43	31. 9	+ 18.26	— 5. 0	+ 1.50	+ 6.50
	12	19.49	31.15	11.26	5. 0	1.45	6.45
	17, 0	26.58	31.20	+ 4.22	4.56	1.39	6.35
	12	34. 9	31.24	— 2.45	4.56	1.33	6.19
	18, 0	41.23	31.26	9.57	4.32	1.27	5.59
	12	48.38	31.27	— 17.11	— 4.14	+ 1.21	+ 5.35

Mercury therefore in Ecliptic ☾ with the Moon, about April 17, 7<sup>h</sup> 22<sup>m</sup>, but differing from her in Latitude, + 6° 25′.

		LONGITUDE.			LATITUDE.		
		☾	♂	♂—☾	☾	♂	♂—☾
— 1424	April 22, h.	° /	° /	° /	° /	° /	° /
	0	98.56	112.35	+ 13.39	— 0.36	+ 1.17	+ 1.53
	12	105.59	112.37	+ 6.38	+ 0. 1	1.17	1.16
	23, 0	112.59	112.39	— 0.20	0.38	1.17	0.39
	12	119.56	112.41	7.15	1.14	1.17	+ 0. 3
	24, 0	126.50	112.43	14. 7	1.49	1.17	— 0.32
	12	133.42	112.45	— 20.57	+ 2.22	+ 1.17	— 1. 5

Jupiter therefore in Ecliptic ☾ with the Moon, about April 22, 23<sup>h</sup> 26<sup>m</sup>, but differing from her in Latitude, + 0° 41′.

		LONGITUDE.			LATITUDE.		
		☾	♂	♂—☾	☾	♂	♂—☾
— 1424	Aug. 18, h.	° /	° /	° /	° /	° /	° /
	0	217.54	224.53	+ 6.59	+ 4.40	— 2.42	— 7.22
	12	224. 6	225.12	+ 1. 6	4.23	2.42	7. 5
	19, 0	230.13	225.31	— 4.42	4. 4	2.42	6.46
	12	236.16	225.50	10.26	3.42	2.42	6.24
	20, 0	242.16	226. 9	16. 7	3.17	2.42	5.59
	12	248.14	226.28	— 21.46	+ 2.51	— 2.42	— 5.33

Mars therefore in Ecliptic ☾ with the Moon, about Aug. 18, 14<sup>h</sup> 17<sup>m</sup>, but differing from her in Latitude, — 7° 1′.

In reply to some further questions, whether such near approaches of the moon and the four planets were likely to occur again within the same space of time, and whether, reckoning from the equinox of  $-1424$ , the longitudes of these conjunctions coincided with the longitudes of the Nakshatras from which the names of the planets are derived, I received the following statements from the Rev. the Radcliffe Observer:—

“With regard to the first of your questions,—it would require an enormously long period to bring the four planets in question into the same relative positions, so as to produce, within an equally short space of time, near approaches of all of them to the moon at ecliptic conjunction. I think therefore we may consider that this set of conjunctions can belong only to the epoch  $-(1424-5)$ ; and there seems to be really some foundation for Bentley’s interpretation of the legend of Daksha’s daughters.

“This seems confirmed by a comparison of the longitudes of the planets in question with the longitudes of the beginnings of the corresponding Lunar Mansions at this epoch (Mr. Hind’s equinox being taken for  $-1424$ ).

“Thus from the data at page xxvii, it appears that, for the epoch  $-1181$ , the beginning of Aśvinī, the first Lunar Mansion, is in longitude  $23^\circ$  nearly, and, reckoned from the equinox of  $-1424$ , it would be in longitude  $20^\circ$  nearly.

“Hence, for  $-1424$ , we have the following table for comparison of the planets’ places with the commencements of the Lunar Mansions from which they are supposed to have derived their names:—

Planet.	Planet’s Longitude.	Longitude of Lunar Mansion.
Mercury	$31^\circ$	$20^\circ$ Rohiṇī.
Venus	$100^\circ$	$100^\circ$ Maghā.
Mars	$225^\circ$	$233^\circ$ P. Ashādhā.
Jupiter	$113^\circ$	$113^\circ$ P. Phālgunī.

“The agreement is certainly remarkable, and probably as close as it could be, considering that the Lunar Mansions must occupy equal spaces.

“On the other hand, it is said that the names of the planets are most probably of modern origin. If this be true, it would appear that the modern Hindús calculated correctly the conjunctions in question, and formed the legends and assigned the names of the planets afterwards from the Lunar Mansions which they occupied.”

It will thus be seen that the statement of Bentley as to the dates of the four conjunctions of the moon and the planets is fully borne out by Mr. Hind’s calculations, and that the coincidence between the legend quoted by Bentley and the astronomical facts determined by Mr. Hind is a real one. Bentley, it is true, does not give his authority, but Prof. Wilson, in a note to his translation of the Vishṇu-Purāṇa (p. 225), speaks distinctly of the legend as occurring in the Vāyu and Linga-Purāṇas; and he mentions that these Purāṇas appeal to the authority of revelation and tradition in support of the birth of the planets in the Nakshatras Ashādhā, &c. This appeal is, of course, unfounded, for in the early Vedic literature, and even in the Laws of the Mánavas, the very existence of planets is unknown. If, however, at a later time the planets were fabled to be daughters of the Nakshatras by Soma, the moon, ecliptical conjunctions of moon and planets in each Nakshatra would certainly



offer the most natural explanation of such a legend. There is only one other explanation that might be suggested. The *Linga-Purāṇa* specifies the position of sun, moon, and planets at the so-called Great Equinox, and the *Vāyu-Purāṇa* mentions the same position as having happened at the end of one of the *Manvantaras*, the *Chākshusha*. At that time the sun is said to have been in *Viśākhā*, the moon in *Kṛttikā*, Venus in *Pushya* (13th *Nakshatra*, instead of *Maghā*, 15th), Jupiter in *Pūrva Phālgunī*, Mars in *Aśādhā*, Mercury in *Dhanishthā* (1st *Nakshatra*, instead of *Rohiṇī*, 9th), Saturn in *Revatī*, Ketu in *Āśleshā*, and *Rāhu* in *Bharanī*. This, whether a real or a fanciful configuration, might have given rise to the names of two of the planets, Jupiter and Mars, but it would leave the names of Venus (*Maghābhū*) and Mercury (*Rauhiṇeya*) unexplained. Now *Rauhiṇeya*, as a name of Mercury, occurs in the *Amara-kosha* (I. 1, 2, 27), and in *Halāyudha*; and in the *Hemachandra-kosha* this planet is called *Rohiṇīsutaḥ*, ‘the son of *Rohiṇī*,’ and *Saumyaḥ*, ‘the son of the moon.’ (See *Indische Studien*, II. p. 261.) In the same *Kosha*, however, Mercury is also called *Śravishtābhūḥ*, ‘born in *Śravishtā*,’ i. e. the first *Nakshatra*; and this, as will be seen, agrees with the statement quoted above from the *Vāyu* and *Linga-Purāṇas*. Among the names of Mars, *Hemachandra* mentions *Aśādhābhūḥ*; among those of Jupiter, *Phālgunībhavaḥ*; among those of Venus, *Maghābhavaḥ*. *Hemachandra* likewise mentions *Revatībhavaḥ* as a name of Jupiter, *Bharanībhūḥ* as a name of *Rāhu*, and *Āśleshābhūḥ* as a name of Ketu, all in conformity with the description of the Great Equinox given in the *Purāṇas*. Whichever explanation of the names of the four planets we adopt, it is certain that the names are of modern date, with the sole exception of *Rauhiṇeya*. None of them occur in the *Sūrya-siddhānta* (see *Sūrya-siddhānta*, ed. Whitney, p. 278); nay, at the time of the *Sūrya-siddhānta*, and with the astronomical views contained in that work, their positions, as far back as — 1424, could not have been ascertained correctly by calculation. Whether subsequent astronomers in India possessed the knowledge necessary for such calculations is a question which I feel not competent to answer; but it seems to me almost as incredible as that an observation of the planets which could have been real but once in the history of the world, namely, in the 15th century B. C., should have been preserved for thousands of years by mere tradition.

# P R E F A C E.

WHEN in the Preface to the fourth volume of my edition of the Rig-veda I felt it my duty to state that for the future my contributions to Vedic literature could be but small, I hardly imagined that it would still fall to my lot to bring out the remaining two volumes of this work. I consoled myself with the thought that I had placed the most important portion of the Rig-veda and its commentary in the hands of Sanskrit scholars, and I felt certain that no one would blame me if, with the new direction which my studies had necessarily to take, first as Professor of Modern European Literature, afterwards as Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford, I could not, as before, devote all my time and strength to the study of Sanskrit. For some years I had indeed to allow Sanskrit to become a mere *παράργον*, partly in order to be able to keep pace with the advance of two most progressive branches of learning, the history of modern European literature, and the science of language, partly in order to fill those gaps which an almost exclusive devotion to the study of Sanskrit for the space of fifteen years would naturally leave in the general knowledge of any scholar. Life is meant for more, at least I think so, than the mere drudgery of collating MSS. and correcting proof-sheets, and those who know what it is to publish a Sanskrit text for the first time, particularly such a work as Sâyaṇa's commentary, full of extracts from works unpublished, full of allusions to authorities but little known or lost altogether, will understand that the printing of six volumes like the present is enough to occupy the best part of a man's life.

If now, after the lapse of ten years, I resume the work of my youth, intending, if life and health be spared, to complete it without further interruption, I do so not without an effort. What I myself wished to learn from Sâyaṇa, I have learnt, and the critical restoration and editing of his text will involve a sacrifice of time which I can ill afford. My own plan was to go on with the translation of the Rig-veda, of which the first volume

appeared in 1870, and to finish some other works which are even nearer to my heart. But the extremely kind way in which I have been urged by scholars, not only in Europe, but also in India, to complete this edition of the text and commentary of the Rig-veda, left me at last no choice, and I only hope that I may not disappoint my friends in spite of all I have done to comply with their wishes.

It is but too true that as we advance in the commentary of Sâyaṇa, the difficulties in restoring a correct text grow greater rather than smaller. The MSS. become more and more faulty, the omissions more numerous, and the really useful variety of readings, represented before in different independent families of MSS., dwindles away into the most perplexing uniformity. This, as I suggested on a former occasion, is probably due to the fact that the later portions of this great work were less frequently studied in the schools of India, so that the MSS. which we possess, either in the original or in copies, did not receive the benefit of those corrections to which as editor I owed so much in the earlier portions of the commentary. I have spared no trouble and expense in order to find out whether MSS. of Sâyaṇa could still be discovered in India which might help me over desperate passages or fill up gaps which occur in all our MSS. My friends in India have really scoured the country, and I have to return to them my most sincere thanks for the trouble they have taken for my sake and for the sake of Sâyaṇa. But the result has not been encouraging. No MSS. have been discovered anywhere which do not belong to the three families, A, B., and C., none to supply deficiencies that run through all the members of these families. Only a few weeks ago I received a letter, dated Tanjore, Dec. 27, 1871, from Mr. Burnell, to whom I had sent a number of test passages for the last Maṇḍala. His search too has been in vain, and though of one MS. which the proprietor would not let out of his possession, Mr. Burnell has not yet been able himself to make a collation, yet he received trustworthy information that it was in precisely the same condition as the MSS. in my possession. If, hereafter, new and independent MSS. of Sâyaṇa's commentary should come to light, I am quite prepared to find that in some places they may convict me of faults, and supply lacunas which I was unable to fill. But the same fate awaits all critical editions. All I can say is that I have done my best to make my *apparatus criticus* as complete as I could make it, and with that *apparatus*

I doubt whether on the whole a more correct text could have been produced than the one which I have given. There is not one doubtful or difficult passage in the whole of this work where I have not myself carefully weighed the evidence of the MSS., not one where I have not myself verified the exact readings of the MSS. even in those portions which were copied and collated for me by others, except where the originals were out of my reach.

I am well aware of the opinion more or less openly expressed by certain Sanskrit scholars that a work such as Sâyaṇa's commentary did not deserve a critical edition, that the time and care bestowed on it were simply wasted, that a mere reprint of one MS. would have been sufficient for all purposes, and that we, the scholars of Europe, may dispense altogether with the assistance of native scholars and commentators. On these points I decline to be drawn into any argument. I have repeatedly expressed and defended my own views on these matters during the last five and twenty years. My own convictions with regard to them have never wavered, and though I hope I can surrender a conviction even when I have held it for a quarter of a century, I do not think that scholars who simply repeat old and, I think, exploded arguments, without even supporting them with such skill and learning as were employed in their defence by former scholars, have any right to insist on a new reply. The evidence is complete, and I am quite prepared to await the verdict.

I cannot, however, leave this subject without entering my most earnest protest against the language used by a scholar for whose learning, and I ought to add, what is far more important, for whose character I have long entertained a sincere respect, I mean Professor Spiegel of Erlangen. In a discussion lately carried on between him and Professor Roth on the question as to what weight we ought to attribute respectively to traditional interpretation and to modern criticism in translating the sacred books of the ancient world, Professor Spiegel tries to show that my views on this subject differ from those of Professor Roth. He says: "Max Müller in seiner Übersetzung des Rigveda äussert sich folgendermassen (I. XV): 'The word translation, however, has many meanings. I mean by translation, not a mere rendering of the hymns of the Rig-veda into English, French, or German, but a full account of the reasons which justify the translator in assigning such a power to such a word, and such a meaning to such a sentence. I mean by trans-

lation a real deciphering, a work like that which Burnouf performed in his first attempts at a translation of the Avesta—a *traduction raisonnée*, if such an expression may be used. Without such a process, without a running commentary, a mere translation of the ancient hymns of the Brahmans will never lead to any solid results.’” Professor Spiegel then continues: “Wollte man diese Ansicht in aller Strenge festhalten und nur eine solche Übersetzung als eine wirkliche gelten lassen, welche mit einem fortlaufenden Commentare versehen ist, so würde man auf die Frage, ob Luther die Bibel übersetzt habe oder Schlegel den Shakspere, eigentlich mit einem herzhaften Nein! antworten müssen, denn keiner von beiden hat seiner Übersetzung einen Commentar beigegeben.”

Now this is not a fair way of arguing. I did not say there was only one kind of translation: I said on the contrary that the word translation has many meanings, and I said this, as will appear from the sentence immediately preceding, because, without such a limitation, it would have been extremely presumptuous on my part to call my translation the first translation of the Rig-veda. The sentence immediately preceding the one quoted by Professor Spiegel runs thus: “It may sound self-contradictory, if, after confessing the help which I derived from these translations, I venture to call my own the first translation of the Rig-veda.” If after that I continue, “I mean by translation not a mere rendering of the hymns into English, French, or German,” every unprejudiced reader will see that these words have a very different meaning from what they would have if they stood by themselves. They do not mean that there is but one way of translating the Rig-veda, but that the translation which I intend to give is meant to be a *traduction raisonnée*.

As therefore I did not say what Professor Spiegel makes me say, I cannot admit that my views and those of Professor Roth on the proper mode of translating the Rig-veda are opposed to each other. There is ample room for such a translation as Professor Roth shadows forth by the side of my own, and there is hardly a word in Professor Roth’s remarks on the subject with which I do not heartily agree. “Eine richtige Übersetzung,” he says, “ist der beste Commentar. Ich kann mich darum mit der Ansicht nicht einverstanden erklären, dass eine Übertragung des Veda nur wenig Nutzen bringen könne, wenn sie nicht von einem ausführlichen Commentar

begleitet sei, und würde, wenn ich daran denken könnte, ein solches Werk zu unternehmen, mich vielmehr bemühen, nicht in die Noten, sondern in den Text den Schwerpunkt der Arbeit zu legen. Die Übersetzung muss für sich selbst reden, eines Commentars bedarf sie in der Regel nur da, wo sie nicht unmittelbar überzeugend, wo der Übersetzer seiner Sache nicht sicher ist. Vor denjenigen Lesern, welche nicht nachrechnen können, auf welchem Weg der Übersetzer zu seinen Combinationen gekommen ist, hat er nicht nöthig sich im Einzelnen zu rechtfertigen, für die andern kann er sich kurz fassen."

All I can say is that there is much force in these remarks, that I feel the truth of them probably more than any one else, and that I have myself frequently pleaded in exactly the same sense. But I cannot disguise from myself or from others that there is considerable danger in these principles of translation, so boldly enunciated, and that all depends on their application. As applied by Langlois and others they have proved most disastrous, in the hands of Professor Roth they might produce the most valuable results. No one would rejoice more than myself if Professor Roth would publish a translation of the Rig-veda, even without any commentary whatever. The public at large would receive such a translation most gratefully, and for many years to come it would answer nearly all purposes. But as far as Sanskrit scholars are concerned, I doubt whether such a translation, however striking and brilliant, would render the more tedious work which I have undertaken altogether useless. No scholar will be satisfied unless he has the complete evidence before him on which a translation is founded. If a meaning is assigned to a certain word, and we do not know that that meaning proves satisfactory in every passage where that word occurs, if we have the slightest misgiving that one single passage may have been left out, the requirements of true scholarship are not fulfilled, the work is imperfect, and each successive generation will have to go through the same process of collecting and collating again and again.

Besides, the argument which has been urged so strongly by all Sanskrit scholars against the assumed infallibility of native commentators and translators cannot surely be warded off from ourselves. If Sâyaṇa is infallible, it has been said again and again, why does he differ from Yâska or Mahîdhara? why does he even differ from himself? Does not the same apply to ourselves, or is there any scholar likely to submit to the *ipse dixit* of another? Let any one compare, for instance, Professor Roth's translation of the Vedic

burial-hymns in the eighth volume, with my own in the ninth volume of the Journal of the German Oriental Society, and he will find that both translations are intelligible, and so far might be said to carry their own conviction; but he will also find that in some very important points they differ. Again, in some of the commonest words Professor Roth's interpretation as given in his Dictionary differs considerably from the interpretation proposed in his earlier essays. To give an instance, we find that in 1846 he translated *apāsām apāstamā*, an epithet of the river Sindhu (X. 75, 7), by "das wasserreichste der Gewässer," as if *apās* were derived from *ap*, water. In the Dictionary *apās* is rightly rendered by *active*, and derived from *āpas*, *opus*. Yet in his Original Sanskrit Texts (vol. V. p. 345), published in 1870, Dr. Muir reverts to the old interpretation, rendering *apāsām apāstamā* by "the most abundant of streams." How are such differences to be settled except by proof, i. e. by a comparison and translation of every passage of the Rig-veda in which the same words and the same ideas occur? Even when this has been achieved, many passages will still remain where that laborious process does not lead us to satisfactory results. But we may honestly say then that all that can be done has been done, and that every one is henceforth left to his own resources. If we keep our *pièces justificatives* to ourselves, no conscientious scholar will accept our conclusions without feeling it his duty to collect the same evidence for himself, and to go over all the passages again as we have done ourselves. Even though I might mistrust my own judgment, the concurrent testimony of the best Sanskrit scholars would leave me no room for doubt on this point, and will certainly not allow me to deviate in future from the method which I have followed in the first volume of my translation.

Having thus, as I hope and trust, made it clear that, if there is any difference of opinion between Professor Roth and myself, it is simply with reference to what at the present moment is likely to be most practically useful, but none whatever as to the principles which ought to be followed in the translation of the Veda or Avesta, I must next complain of the manner in which Professor Spiegel contradicts me with regard to Burnouf's principles of interpretation, and tries to enlist that eminent scholar as a supporter of his own views on the paramount importance of the traditional interpretation of the Avesta. Professor Spiegel thinks it becoming to say: "Es ist daher 'ganz falsch,' wenn Max Müller (Essays I. 124, der deutschen

Ausgabe) den Standpunct Burnoufs als verschieden von dem meinigen darstellt und sich folgendermassen äussert: ‘Ein Gelehrter wie Burnouf jedoch, der zum ersten Mal darauf ausging, von jedem Wort des Zendavesta Rechenschaft zu geben, jede grammatische Endung zu erklären, jeden Satz in seine Bestandtheile aufzulösen und die wahre Bedeutung jedes Ausdrucks durch eine etymologische Analyse und Vergleichung verwandter Wörter im Sanskrit zu ergründen, vermochte aus diesen überlieferten Übersetzungen nur geringen Nutzen und Rath zu ziehen.’ Bekanntlich hat Burnouf gerade das Gegentheil gesagt und seine Arbeiten über das Avesta sind eine fortgesetzte Widerlegung der eben angeführten Behauptung. Man schlage Burnoufs Schriften auf, wo man will, wo er ein neues Wort erklärt, wird man ihn stets von der Tradition ausgehend finden, die Billigung der traditionellen Angabe bildet gewöhnlich den Schluss seiner Untersuchung, die Abweichung von der Tradition ist Ausnahme.”

Now these are strong words:—but what are the facts? I shall not appeal to those who attended Burnouf’s lectures at the *Collège de France*, and who know with what ingenuity and irony Burnouf delighted to dissect the traditional interpretations whether of Sâyana or of Neriosengh or of Anquetil, and how he enjoyed every opportunity of explaining the Veda by the Zendavesta and the Zendavesta by the Veda. I shall appeal to his own printed words in order to show that, from the very beginning, Burnouf looked upon the traditional interpretation of the Zendavesta as, no doubt, extremely useful in a first attempt to disentangle the words and to guess at their meaning, but as of no authority in itself. Whether the tradition was right or wrong, he held that under all circumstances it had to be confirmed by an independent grammatical and etymological analysis of the original text\*.

In his *Commentaire sur le Yaçna*, p. xxvii, he says: “Le problème que j’avais à résoudre était celui-ci: étant donné un mot zend auquel les Parses attribuent une signification que la comparaison des textes et l’étude des langues qui appartiennent à la même famille ne confirment ni n’expliquent, justifier le sens donné par les Parses ou en trouver un autre.”

Thus he asserts from the very beginning the independence of his criticism. Again, p. xxxii, he says: “Je fais suivre la version de Nériosengh de celle d’Anquetil, parce que c’est une autre expression du sens traditionnel; et, après avoir mis sous les yeux du lecteur ce double moyen d’interprétation, je me

\* Chips from a German Workshop, vol. I. p. 138.



livre à la discussion de chacun des mots du paragraphe, comparant entre elles les variantes des manuscrits, et terminant par un résumé *qui confirme ou rectifie* la traduction de Nériosengh, ou celle d'Anquetil, ou l'une et l'autre à la fois."... "Car, de trois choses l'une, ou je pense que la traduction de Nériosengh ou celle d'Anquetil, ou l'une et l'autre à la fois, sont exactes, et alors la discussion a pour but de prouver cette opinion; ou, ce qui est beaucoup plus fréquent, je rectifie la traduction d'Anquetil à l'aide de celle de Nériosengh ou de l'analyse du texte; ou enfin, je trouve que la traduction d'Anquetil et celle de Nériosengh sont inexactes, mais ni l'une ni l'autre ne me donnent les moyens d'en proposer une nouvelle."

All this was written in 1838, and before Rosen's edition of the first book of the Rig-veda had been published. When Burnouf had discovered what assistance might be derived from the Veda for a correct interpretation of the Zendavesta, he spoke with even greater precision. In the introduction to his *Études sur la langue et sur les textes Zends*, he writes (in 1840): "La plupart de ces termes sont obscurs, et Anquetil en a rarement saisi le véritable sens; souvent même la tradition des Parses, qui a servi de base à son travail, se tait sur leur signification précise, et l'analyse philologique peut seule en faire soupçonner l'origine et l'application. Ici, comme dans mon Commentaire sur le Yaçna, je ferai amplement usage de ce dernier moyen; mais j'aurai l'avantage d'y joindre les secours que fournit la connaissance plus avancée aujourd'hui du dialecte védique. Grâce aux travaux d'un savant à jamais regrettable (Fr. Rosen), nous pouvons maintenant étudier une portion assez étendue du Rigvêda, et mettre à profit, pour l'intelligence des livres zends, un texte qui n'était pas accessible au moment où j'ai publié le commencement de mon Commentaire sur le Yaçna. Les analogies nombreuses qu'offrent les Vêdas avec ce que nous possédons du Zend Avesta, sous le rapport du langage et des idées, ne seront, je le pense, méconnues de personne..."

Still more striking than in the case of grammatical forms is the complete independence with which Burnouf treated the Parsi tradition, whether embodied in Anquetil's or Nériosengh's translation, when discussing questions of doctrine. Thus, to mention but one instance\*, the dogma of the resurrection, which, according to Anquetil's translation, would seem to be mentioned again and again in the ancient Zend texts, was completely eliminated by Burnouf's

\* *Études sur la langue et sur les textes Zends*, pp. 1-82.

analysis\*, and though he gives Neriosengh credit for not introducing this dogma, yet he adds at once, "l'inexactitude manifeste de la version de Nériosengh infirme gravement l'argument négatif que je me crois en droit de tirer de son texte."

I could add many more passages to show that Burnouf, though never neglectful of the assistance which the tradition of the Parsis offers for an interpretation of the Avesta, always asserted the supremacy of European scholarship, and that he did this the more strongly the more he advanced in his study of the Avesta and the Veda. But the extracts I have given will suffice to show that what I wrote of Burnouf was written deliberately, more deliberately, I trust, than Professor Spiegel imagined. That it would have been almost impossible for Burnouf to decipher the language of the Avesta without the assistance of the Parsi tradition is well known to all Zend scholars. As a preliminary step that tradition was as indispensable to the students of the Avesta, as Sâyaṇa's commentary was to the students of the Veda. But when the time came "to give an account of every word in the Zend texts, to explain each grammatical termination, to parse every sentence, and to establish the true meaning of every term," then, I repeat again, Burnouf found that both Anquetil and Neriosengh offered him but scant assistance. More than this I did not intend to say, and I doubt whether on calmer reflection Professor Spiegel would say again that in this I was "quite wrong." The sincere regard which I have always entertained for Professor Spiegel made it impossible for me to allow such expressions, as coming from him, to pass unnoticed and unchallenged, nor do I stand alone in regretting that in their crude, and my friend Professor Spiegel will forgive me for adding, in their somewhat rude form, they should ever have been allowed to appear in the pages of the Journal of the German Oriental Society.

But allowing even that people might differ as to the real value of the Veda and, more particularly, of Sâyaṇa's commentary, I feel that a work

\* Though Burnouf's explanation of *viçpâi yavê*, for all time, and of *yavaê ca yavaêtâtaê ca*, for ever and ever, seem beyond the reach of criticism, it is curious to observe the expression *višvâyave* in the Veda (X. 22, 14) used in the sense of for ever, once for all. *Višvâyuh*, too, must frequently be taken in the Veda as an adverb, meaning "always." In passages like I. 27, 3; 67, 6; 68, 5, &c., the sense forbids to take

*višvâyuh* as a nominative, the accent shows that it is not a vocative of *višvâyus*. Professor Benfey rightly translates it by "Lebenslang;" Professor Roth takes *višvâyuh* everywhere as an adjective in the sense of *višvâkrishṭi*, dwelling among all people. This is a case in point where a translation of all the passages in which *višvâyuh* occurs could alone show whether it should be taken as an adjective or as an adverb.

which is the oldest literary record of the Aryan, if not of the whole human race, together with that commentary which represents to us the last result of native traditional exegesis, deserved to be edited once for all with at least the same care as the love-songs of Catullus or of Walther von der Vogelweide. Nor should I have consented to be the editor unless I had been allowed to follow my own judgment in these matters, and to apply in editing Sāyana's commentary the same principles of critical scholarship which I had learnt to respect in the schools of Hermann and Haupt.

Some years ago, on receiving two new MSS. from India, I gave a short account of their relative position and value in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (December, 1866). I here subjoin the more important portions of that article.

Having lately received two new MSS. of Sāyana's commentary on the *Rig-veda*, I thought that a few lines on the character of these MSS., and on the proper use to be made of Sanskrit MSS. in general, might be of some interest both in England and in India. I owe these MSS. to the kindness and enlightened generosity of Dr. Bhao Daji, who is well known to the members of the *Royal Asiatic Society*, both as an intelligent collector of Indian antiquities, inscriptions, and manuscripts, and as a careful and successful inquirer into the history and chronology of India. I had explained to him and to other friends of mine in India the great difficulties I have to contend with in editing the two final *Ashtakas* of the *Rig-veda*. Whenever I heard of the existence of an old or otherwise promising MS. of Sāyana, I always sent to my correspondents in India a number of test passages, in order to find out whether the MS. in question contained any independent readings. A collation of three or four passages in which all my MSS. shared exactly the same mistake, was generally sufficient to establish whether or no the new MS. represented an independent family, and a comparison of some other passages in which one of the three families had its peculiar faults or omissions, sufficed to show to which of the three the MS. belonged.

It is well known by this time that a mere collation of MSS. and an accumulation of various readings are of little use for critical purposes. MSS. are copied one from another, and if we have ten MSS. all copied from the same original, the various readings of these MSS. are clearly of no documentary value whatever. It is quite possible that here and there some of the

more intelligent copyists may have been struck by the palpable errors of the original before them, and the corrections which they introduced may carry conviction to every reader. Yet, according to the principles of diplomatic criticism so well laid down by Lachmann, and at present adopted by all classical scholars of note, these corrections can claim no more authority than the conjectures of any living scholar, unless it can be proved, and this is very difficult, that the copyist had before him more than one MS. at the time. The object of diplomatic criticism is not to restore the most correct or the most plausible text, but that text, with all its mistakes and omissions, which a comparison of all the MSS. at our disposal places within our reach. Hence our first object in examining and collating MSS. must be to establish their respective worth and weight as witnesses. We ought to be most careful not to allow ourselves to be swayed either by the beautiful writing or by the age of any MS. Though the age of a MS. is always a matter of considerable importance, it happens not unfrequently that a modern copy possesses greater documentary value than an older copy, for the simple reason that it was copied straight from a MS. of greater age than any which we have access to. This is the case, for instance, with regard to the Ca. MS. of Sāyana, which, although the oldest, is of far less value critically than the modern MS. A. Colebrooke. Let it once be established that out of ten MSS., B, C, D, are copied from A; that E, F, G, H, I, can all be traced back to a common source; and that J stands by itself:—then the office of an editor is simply to establish for each doubtful passage the reading of A, the reading that will account for the variations, if any, in E, F, G, H, I, and the reading of J. To give one of these readings in the printed text and the others in the notes, is all that can be required of him. After confronting in numerous places the evidence of three witnesses, it will, generally, be possible to arrive at an estimate of their respective value, and it is no doubt the greatest triumph of diplomatic criticism if it is possible, by conclusive evidence, to establish the paramount authority of one among three or more apparently independent traditions. In classical philology, where we have mostly to deal with MSS. which directly or indirectly must be traced back to the original MS. of one individual author, the establishment of one supreme authority is an object never to be lost sight of. In India, where the individual author is frequently merged in a school, and where oral teaching

opens, even in modern times, so wide a door to disturbing influences, we must be prepared to arrive in the end at several independent authorities, generally localised in the principal seats of Brahmanic learning. Thus, although there may have been one original text of the Rāmāyaṇa, it would clearly be in vain to attempt to restore that text by subjecting the two traditional texts to an eclectic criticism. All that an editor can do, is to give either the one or the other text according to the MSS. and to the commentaries, belonging to the one or the other school. The same applies to literary works which are ascribed to individual authors, as the play of Śakuntalā, ascribed to Kālidāsa. Here, too, the two traditional texts or "recensions" must be kept apart, though, in this case, it is less difficult to decide which of the two is the original. With regard to the text of the Vedas, the Brahmans themselves recognised the existence of independent traditions or branches (śākhās); they chronicled the various readings of the hymns and even of the Brāhmaṇas, and this at so early a date that we cannot ascribe these variations to the negligence of scribes, but only to the influence of oral tradition, kept up in different families and schools. What applies to the text of the Vedas, applies with equal, or even greater, force to their commentaries. Although the commentary of Sāyaṇa was composed as late as the fifteenth century of our era, and although I possess one MS., written not more than about a hundred years later, yet that MS. (Ca.) cannot claim the supreme authority, which, for instance, the codex Laurentianus A. claims among the MSS. of Sophocles. The MS. of Colebrooke (A 2), although of a much more modern date, about 1761 A.D., represents in innumerable passages a less corrupt and less mangled text; at all events a text which could not possibly have passed through that phase which is exhibited in Ca. I have repeatedly, in the prefaces to my edition of the Rig-veda, explained the principles by which I have been guided in restoring the text of Sāyaṇa. Having to supply a text that should be practically useful, I have now and then had to deviate from the strict principles of diplomatic criticism, so far as to place manifest blunders, even when they were supported by all the MSS., in the notes. I have chiefly done so when none of the readings of the MSS. would have yielded any sense whatever, or, when I was enabled, by consulting the originals from which Sāyaṇa quoted, to support my corrections by independent authority. I have on two or three occasions allowed

an explanation, though it appeared in one or two MSS. only, and was clearly a marginal note due to the hand of a later student, and not Sāyaṇa's own, to form part of the printed text, simply because I imagined it would be useful, and might be passed over if given only in the notes. Deviations like these from the strict rules followed by Lachmann, Haupt, and others, have always been noted in the *Varietas Lectionis*. I do not wish to defend them even in the edition of a work like Sāyaṇa's commentary, and I have tried to avoid them in the later volumes.

In order to show the position which the two new MSS. of Sāyaṇa, lately received from Dr. Bhao Daji, hold in the well-established pedigree of Sāyaṇa's MSS., I have chosen a passage where Sāyaṇa gives a long extract from a Brāhmaṇa. Such extracts are generally full of blunders, and unless they can be verified in the original from which they are taken, they are very troublesome to an editor. Their usefulness, however, for determining the relative position of our MSS. is all the greater, because the scribes, who had little difficulty in correcting blunders in the uniform and business-like style of Sāyaṇa, found it more difficult to deal with the antiquated words and grammatical forms of the Brāhmaṇas, and therefore contented themselves generally with copying letter by letter the original before them. It will be seen at one glance, by comparing the texts of the various MSS. in this passage, that of the two MSS. lent to me by Dr. Bhao Daji, the one which I mark CB. belongs to the B. class, the other which I mark AD. belongs to the A. class. The first MS. (CB.) is written in a beautiful hand, with large and distinct letters, and contains both text and commentary. It has no date, at least not in that portion of it which I was able to examine. The other MS. (AD.) is likewise written in a very distinct hand, but the letters are smaller and less carefully formed. In the centre of each page, space is left for inserting the text, but it is only in the sixth Ashtaka, and in the seventh as far as fol. 51, that the text has been added. In the eighth Ashtaka the commentary occupies the whole page, no space being left for the text. At the end of the eighth Ashtaka a date is given, 1813, as it would seem, of Samvat, i.e. 1757 A.D. The name of the writer is not clear, but it may be meant for Sadāśmī, the son of Jagannātha. Whoever the writer was, he lived, like the writer of Colebrooke's MS., at Benares, and this so far confirms my opinion that the A. class represents the Benares

text, in the same manner as the B. class represents the scholastic tradition of Bombay and Punah, and the C. class, at least in the earlier Ashtakas, that of Calcutta. In order to explain the arrangement of the following extracts, I have only to add that the first class of MSS. comprises, besides the MSS. of Dr. Bhao Daji and Colebrooke, the two C. MSS., which, as I pointed out in the preface to the second volume of my edition (p. viii), are in the later Ashtakas derived from an A. source\*. Taylor's MS. too, which in the earlier Ashtakas belonged to the B. class, and was therefore marked B 4, belongs in the eighth Ashtaka to the A. class. How this came to pass is easily explained by the fact that these MSS. were copied from different originals lent to Taylor, Mill, and Wilson by persons residing in different parts of India. The second, or C. class, is now represented by one MS. only, the oldest hitherto known in Europe, which I continue to quote as Ca. In the third, or B. class, B 1 is the MS. of Stevenson; B 2 the MS. of Burnouf, as copied by me (I hope, correctly) in 1847; B 3 is the new copy mentioned by me in the preface to the second volume, now in the hands of Dr. Goldstücker, and kindly collated by him for me; BM. is a short fragment of the last Ashtaka which I received from Dr. Haug; CB. is the MS. lent me by Dr. Bhao Daji. The last line gives the text as it may be re-established from an intercomparison of the three families of Sāyana's MSS. I do not maintain that it represents exactly what Sāyana wrote, still less that it gives the correct text of the Śātyāyanaka. It is simply impossible, with the MSS. at our disposal, to restore a text that might claim to be identical with Sāyana's own writing. All that can be claimed for our text is that it represents Sāyana's writing as far as it can *now* be restored with the help of our MSS. It gives what is obtainable with a strict observance of the rules of diplomatic criticism. It is not only possible, but extremely likely, that if to-morrow we obtained Sāyana's own manuscript, whether from the ruins of Vidyānagara, where a complete collection of his works is said to have been buried, or from the MS. which Dr. Haug saw at Ahmadabad, and to which he assigns the date of Samvat 1526, A.D. 1470, we should find slight variations between Sāyana's original and the nearest

\* Dr. Mill's MS. (C 2 or C. Mill) and Professor Wilson's MS. (C 4 or C. Wilson) were both copied at Calcutta, but not from either A. or Ca., so that occasionally they supply independent readings where the other A. MSS. are either corrupt or imperfect. (See Rv. VIII. 91, 3; 91, 4; 101, 14, &c.)

approach to it that is within our reach. It is still more likely that if a MS. of the Śātyāyanaka were recovered in India, there might be between it and our own restored text, considerable discrepancy. The students of Sāyaṇa's commentary know that this is frequently the case when Sāyaṇa quotes from Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, of which we possess both MSS. and printed texts; and we have our choice between supposing that Sāyaṇa quoted from memory and without caring about minute accuracy, or that he quoted from a śākhā different from that which is before us. It would be easy, no doubt, to improve the text of the Brāhmaṇa, as here printed, by conjecture. But those who know the mischief done by conjectural criticism in classical scholarship, will deprecate, most strongly, any countenance given to it by Sanskrit scholars. It may be truly said that the chief business of modern critics is to cleanse the text of the classics from the improvements introduced by the ingenious editors of the last three centuries, and we ought not to neglect this lesson in preparing our own *editiones principes*. Let an editor give what there is, and let the commentator and translator say what might be, or what ought to be.

{ AD.	अचोक्ताख्येन	शाट्वायन	शाट्वायनकं	असमितिं	राज्याप्रोष्ठं
A.	अचोक्ताख्येन		शाट्वायनकं	असमितिं	राज्याप्रोष्ठं
{ C 2.	अचोक्ताख्येन		शाट्वायनकं	असमितिं	राज्याप्रोष्ठं
C 4.	अचोक्ताख्येन		शाट्वायनकं	असमितिं	राजाप्रोष्ठं
B 4.	अचोक्ताख्येन		शाट्वायनकमसमितिं	राज्यप्रोष्ठं	
{ Ca.	अचोक्ताख्येन		शाट्वायनकं	असमितिं	राज्याप्रोष्ठं
{ B 1.	तचोक्ताख्याने		शाट्वायनकं ।	असमितिं	राज्यात्प्रोष्ठं
B 2.	तचोक्ताख्याने		शाट्वायनकं ॥	असमितिं	राज्यात्प्रोष्ठं
{ B 3.	तचोक्ताख्याने		शाट्वायनकं	असमितिं	राज्यात्प्रोष्ठं
BM.	तचोक्ताख्याने		शाट्वायनकं	असमितिं	राज्यात्प्रोष्ठं
CB.	तचोक्ताख्याने		शाट्वायनकं	असमितिं	राज्यात्प्रोष्ठं
	Text in M. M.'s edition.	अचोक्ताख्याने	शाट्वायनकं ।	असमितिं	राज्यात्प्रोष्ठं

<sup>1</sup> The B. MSS. differ from the A. and Ca. MSS. MSS. have the mistake अख्येन, which reappears in by putting तच instead of अच. The repetition of the still more corrupt Ca. उक्ताख्येन.

शाट्वायन is a slip of the writer of A.D.

<sup>2</sup> All B. MSS. have अख्येन right, while the A. असमितिं; the A. MSS. are right; Ca. blunders in

<sup>3</sup> All the B. MSS. blunder in the third vowel of



- AD. गोपायना अभ्यगामंस्ते खांडवे सचमासताद्य हासमातौ  
 A. गोपायना अभ्यागमंस्ते खांडवे सचमासताद्य हासमातौ  
 C 2. गोपायना अभ्यगामंस्ते खांडवे सचमासताद्य हासमातौ  
 C 4. गोपायना अभ्यगामंस्ते खांडवे सचमासताद्य हासमातौ  
 B 4. गोपायना अभ्यगासंस्ते खांडवे सचमासताद्य हासमातौ

- { Ca. गोपायनोयं अभ्यगासंस्तेषां खांडवे सचमासताद्य हासमातौ

- { B 1. गोपायना अभ्यंगासंस्ते खांडवे सचमासतथा हासमातौ  
 B 2. गोपायना अभ्यंगासंस्ते खांडवे सचमास तथा हासमातौ  
 B 3. गोपायना अभ्यंगासंस्ते खांडवे सचमास मातौ  
 BM. गोपायना अभ्यंगासंस्ते खांडवे सचमास मातौ  
 CB. गोपायना अभ्यंगासंस्ते खांडवे सचमास मातौ  
 Text in M. M.'s edition. गोपायना अभ्यगमंस्ते खांडवे सचमासताद्य हासमातौ

- { AD. राज्यप्रोष्ठे किंलाताकुली दूषनुरसुमीयौ त ह स्मानग्रौ  
 A. राज्यप्रोष्ठे किंलाताकुली दूषनुरसुमीयौ त ह स्मानग्रौ  
 C 2. राज्यप्रोष्ठे किंलाताकुली दूषनुरसुसीयौ त ह स्मानग्रौ  
 C 4. राज्यप्रोष्ठे किंलाताकुली दूषनुरसुसीयौ त ह स्मानग्रौ  
 B 4. राज्याप्रोष्ठे किंलाताकुली दूषनुरसमीयौ त (म) ह स्माहनग्रौ

leaving out the *anuvāra*. The patronymic name of Asamāti, which I suppose to be राज्यप्रोष्ठे, is corrupt in all MSS.; the A. MSS. agree in राज्याप्रोष्ठे except B 4, which has been corrected, and C 4, which has the slight variation of राजाप्रोष्ठे; while the B. MSS. support throughout at all events the *vriddhi* vowel of the third syllable, which also appears in the faulty reading of Ca.: B 1 and 2 are more closely united, and so are B 3, BM., and CB.; the former giving राज्यात्प्रोष्ठे or प्रोष्ठे, the latter राज्याप्रोष्ठे or प्रोष्ठे; see Rv. X. 60, 5. On Asamāti see Lassen, Indische Alterthumskunde (first edition), vol. I. p. xiii. note 31; Colebrooke, Misc. Essays, I. p. 25.

<sup>4</sup> B M. stands alone in furnishing the right reading

गोपायना, the correction probably of an individual copyist, unsupported even by the nearest MS. CB. The short vowel in the second syllable is equally peculiar to BM.

<sup>5</sup> The right reading अभ्यगमंस्ते is nearly preserved in A. Other MSS. belonging to this class, C 2, C 4, and AD. slide into अभ्यगासंस्ते. B 4 seems to give अभ्यगासंस्ते, and this is the reading of Ca. The B. MSS. add to it a new mistake अभ्यगासंस्ते.

<sup>6</sup> The A. class and Ca. have throughout the right reading चासत, followed by सद्य, which I think is meant for स्य. B 1 and 2 have taken तथा as one word, and left चास without the त, thus rendering it unintelligible. B 3, BM., and CB. have all the same lacuna.

{ Ca. राज्यप्रोष्ठे किलाताकुली दूषनुरसमीयौ न ह स्मानमौ

B 1. राज्यात्षा कुली दूषनुरसमीयौ तमह स्मानमौ

B 2. राज्यात्षाष्टे कुली दूषनुरसमीयौ तमह स्मानमौ

B 3. राज्योत्प्रोष्ठे किलांताकुली दूषनुरसमीयौ नमह स्मानमौ

BM. राज्योत्प्रोष्ठे किलांताकुली दूषनुरसमीयौ तमह स्मानमौ

CB. राज्यात्प्रोष्ठे किलांताकुली दूषनुरसमीयौ नमह स्मानमौ

Text in  
M. M.'s  
edition.

रायप्रोष्ठे<sup>7</sup> किलांताकुली ऊषतुरंसुरमायौ<sup>10</sup> तं ह<sup>11</sup> स्मानमौ

<sup>7</sup> The patronymic has again puzzled the scribes. The A. and Ca. MSS. now agree in राज्यप्रोष्ठे or राज्यप्रोष्ठे. B 4 brings in the long आ in राज्याप्रोष्ठे, which seems to come from B. though accidentally only. B 1 and 2 have राज्यात्षाष्टे and ७ष्ठे, to which they inclined before; while B 3, BM., and CB. approach to their former blunder राज्याप्रोष्ठे.

<sup>8</sup> The *anusvāra* in किं is the characteristic mark of the A. class. B 1 and 2 are held together by their common lacuna; B 3, BM., and CB. by the *anusvāra* on the second syllable.

<sup>9</sup> The spelling of दूषतुः or दूषनुः seems to point to ऊषतुः. The verb वस्, to dwell, may be construed with a locative, in the sense of "to dwell within."

<sup>10</sup> असुमीयौ is probably intended for असुरमायौ. The readings of the different MSS. might seem to suggest समीपौ or असमीपौ, but I prefer असुरमायौ because this word is used in the Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa XIII. 12. There we find two Māyā's, evidently treated as females, but acting a similar part to that assigned to the two priests in our legends. I subjoin the text and Sāyaṇa's commentary (MS. Wilson 396, p. 161 a): गौपायनानां वै सत्रमासीनानां किरातकुल्यावसुरमाये अंतःपरिधूमन्याकिरातां तेऽग्ने त्वं नो अंतम इत्यग्नि-मुपासीदंस्तेनासूनस्पृखंस्तद्वाव ते तस्मैकामयंत कामसनि साम गृहैः काममेवैतेनावहेथ इति ॥ Com. गौपायनानां गौ(गो?)पगोत्राणां सत्रमासीनानां सत्रासनं कुर्वैतामृषीणा-

मसूनप्राणान्किरातकुल्यौ । किराता श्रेष्ठः । तत्तु त्यरूपे असुरमाये असुरसंबंधिन्यौ माये अंतः परिधि आहवनीयस्य परिधीनां मध्यदेशे प्राकिरातां । प्रक्रमेण व्यक्षिपतां । कृ विक्षेप इति धातुः । ततस्ते गौपायना अग्ने त्वं नो अंतम इति तृचेनाग्निमुपासीदन् । उपागच्छन् । अस्तुवन्नित्यर्थः । तेनोपसदनेनाग्नेः प्रसादात्पुनरात्मोयानसूनस्पृखन् । अबल्यन् । मायापरिक्षिप्तान्युनरादाय प्रवतानकुर्वन्नित्यर्थः । ते गौपायनास्तस्मिन्समय एतदेव तस्मैकामयंत तस्माद्गृहैः । कामसनि कामप्रदं । गतमन्यत् ॥ Here then किरातकुल्यौ would have to be taken in the sense of "of the race of, or similar to Kirātas," it would be a feminine, corresponding to असुरमाये, and the singular in the feminine would therefore be किरातकुली, masc. किरातकुलः. In our passage, on the contrary, किलांताकुली must be a masculine in the nom. dual, and would therefore lead us to suppose that किरात and अस्तुलि were the names of the two sorcerers. They occur again as male demons in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa I. 1, 4, 14, and in the Bṛihaddevatā. Sāyaṇa in his commentary on the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa explains किराताकुली by किरातश्चाकुलिश्च द्वावसुरपुरोहितौ बभूवुः । In another passage, the Tāṇḍya (XIII. 7) uses the fem. termination of the dual (ध्वसे for ध्वसौ) for the masc. Here, however, the commentator calls it लिंगव्यत्ययः.

<sup>11</sup> The A. MSS. agree on त ह, i.e. तं ह, for the म of B 4 is from the margin. The B. MSS., on the contrary, all point to तमह.

- AD. निधायोदनं पवतो ग्री मांस यथासुरा रा न्नं दग्धेष्वाकवः  
 A. निधायोदनं पवनो ग्री मांस यथासुरा रान्नं दग्धेष्वाकवः  
 C 2. नि ध्ययोदनं पवतो ग्री मांस यथासुरा रान्नं दग्धेष्वाकवः  
 C 4. नि ध्ययोदनं पवतो ग्री मांस यथासुरा रा न्नं दग्धेष्वाकवः  
 B 4. निधायोदनं पचतो ग्री मांस मथासुरा अन्नं दग्धेष्वाकवः  
 Ca. निधायोदनं पचतो ग्री मांसं यथासुरा चं दस्वा कवयः  
 B 1. निधायोदनं पचतो ग्री मांसमथासुरा रान्नं दग्धेष्वाकवः  
 B 2. निधायोदनं पचतो ग्री मांसमथासुरा रान्नं दग्धेष्वाकवः  
 B 3. निधायोदनं पचतो ग्री मांसमथासुरा रान्नं दग्धेष्वाकवः  
 BM. निधायोदनं पचतो ग्री मांसमथासुरा रान्नं दग्धेष्वाकवः  
 CB. निधायोदनं पचतो ग्री मांसमथासुरा रान्नं दग्धेष्वाकवः  
 Text in M. M.'s edition. ऽनिधायोदनं पचतो ऽग्री मांसमथासुरा अन्नं दग्धेष्वाकवः

- AD. परावभूवुः तमसमाति रांयप्रौष्ट गोपायनामाहुतयो  
 A. परावभूवुः तमसमाति रायप्रौष्टं गोपायनमाहुतयो  
 C 2. परावभूवुः तमसमातिं राद्य प्रौष्टं गोपायना मा हुतयो  
 C 4. परावभूवुः तमसमातिं राद्य प्रौष्टं गोपायना मा हुतयो  
 B 4. परावभूवुः तमसमातिं राज्यप्रौष्टं गोपायनानामाहुतयो  
 Ca. परावभूवुः तमसमातिं रायप्रौष्टं गोपायनं मा हुत तो  
 B 1. परा समति रायप्रौष्टं गोपायनामाहुतयो  
 B 2. परा समति रायप्रौष्टं गोपायनामाहुतयो  
 B 3. परा समतिं रायप्रौष्टं गोपायनामां हुतयो  
 BM. परा समतिं रायप्रौष्टं गोपायनामां हुतयो  
 CB. परा समतिं रायप्रौष्टं गोपायनामां हुतयो  
 Text in M. M.'s edition. परावभूवुः । तमसमातिं रायप्रौष्टं गोपायनानामाहुतयो

<sup>12</sup> निधायोदनं marks the A. and Ca. MSS.; निधायोदनं the B. MSS.

<sup>13</sup> The A. MSS. agree in मांस यथा, instead of मांसमथा which is intended by the B. MSS. B 4 has the B. reading, and alone of all MSS. supplies the reading अन्नं. In Ca. the two readings are mixed.

<sup>14</sup> In the lacuna after परा and in समति we have marked features of the entire B. class. B 4 has its own peculiar mistake, परावभूवुः, which could only refer to the two Asuras, while it is meant for the Ikshvākus, i.e. Asamāti and the Rathaproshtas.

- [ A.D. भ्यनयन् साच वीदिमौ किलाताकुली इमा वै मा गौपा-  
 A. भ्यतपन् सा च वीदिमौ किलाताकुली इमा वै मा गौपा-  
 C 2. भ्यतपन् साच वीदिमौ किलाताकुली इमा वै मा गौपा-  
 C 4. भ्यतपन् साच वीदिमौ किलाताकुली इमा वै मा गौपा-  
 B 4. भ्यतपन् स्तो ब्रवीदिमौ किलाताकुली इमा वै वे मा गोपा-  
 { Ca. त्थ तयन् सौ ब्रवीदिमौ कि रं ला राकुली इमा वै गोपा-  
 B 1. भ्यपतन् सो ब्रवीदिमो किलाताकुली इमा वै मा गोपा-  
 B 2. भ्यपतन् सो ब्रवीदिमो किलाताकुली इमा वै मा गोपा-  
 B 3. भ्यपतन् सो ब्रवीदिमो किलाताकुली इमा वै मा गोपा-  
 B.M. भ्यपतन् सो ब्रवीदिमो किलाताकुली इमा वै मा गोपा-  
 C.B. भ्यपतन् सो ब्रवीदिमो किलाताकुली इमा वै मा गोपा-  
 Text in M. M.'s edition. ऽभ्यतपन्<sup>16</sup> सो ऽब्रवीदिमौ किलाताकुली इमा वै मा गौपा-

- [ A.D. यनानामाहुतयो भितपंतीति तावब्रूनां तस्य वा अवमेव  
 A. यनानामाहुतयो भितपंतीति तावब्रूतां तस्य वा अवमेव  
 C 2. यनानामाहुतयो भितपंतीति तावब्रूनां तस्य वा अवमेव  
 C 4. यनानामाहुतयो भितपंतीति तावब्रूनां तस्य वा अवमेव  
 B 4. यनामाहुतयो नितपंतीति तावब्रूतां तस्य वा आवमेव  
 { Ca. यनानामाहुतयो भिनयंतीति तावब्रूतां तस्य वा आवामच  
 B 1. यना अभिपतंतीति तावब्रूतां तस्य वा अवमेव  
 B 2. यना अभिपतंतीति तावब्रूतां तस्य वा अवमेव  
 B 3. यना अभिपतंतीति तावब्रूतां तस्य अवमेव  
 B.M. यना अभिपतंतीति तावब्रूतां तस्य अवमेव  
 C.B. यना अभिपतंतीति तावब्रूतां तस्य अवमेव  
 Text in M. M.'s edition. यनानामाहुतयो<sup>17</sup> ऽभितपंतीति तावब्रूतां तस्य वा<sup>18</sup> आवमेव<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> The A. class is again marked by retaining the correct **अभ्यतपन्** though not always clearly written, whereas the B. MSS. have clearly **अभ्यपतन्**.

<sup>17</sup> The B. MSS. again agree in the mistake **गोपायना**.

<sup>18</sup> The B. class is sharply marked by the lacuna of

**आहुतयो** and again by **अभिपतंति** instead of **अभितपंति**, and the short vowel in **करिष्यवो**.

<sup>19</sup> The omission of **वा** shows the close relationship of B 3, B.M., and C.B.

<sup>19</sup> The original reading was probably **आवमेव**; cf. *Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa* I. 1, 4, 15, **आवमिति ह्रस्वोच्चारणं**.

- { AD. भेजो स्था अवं प्रायश्चित्तिरापं तथा करिष्यावो यथा  
 A. भेजो स्था अवं प्रायश्चित्तिरापं तथा करिष्यावो यथा  
 C 2. भेजो स्था अवं प्रायश्चित्तिरापं तथा करिष्यावो यथा  
 C 4. भेजो स्था अवं प्रायश्चित्तिरापं तथा करिष्यावो यथा  
 B 4. भिषजो स्थ आवं प्रायश्चित्तिरापं तथा करिष्यावो यथा  
 { Ca. भेषजौ स्न्यं अचं प्रायश्चित्तिराचं तथा करिष्यावो यथा  
 { B 1. भेषजौ स्थ अवं प्रायश्चित्तिरायं तथा करिष्यवो यथा  
 B 2. भेषजौ स्थ अवं प्रायश्चित्तिरायं तथा करिष्यवो यथा  
 B 3. भेषजौ स्थ अवं प्रायश्चित्तिरायं तथा करिष्यदो यथा  
 B M. भेषजौ स्थ अवं प्रायश्चित्तिरायं तथा करिष्यदो यथा  
 C B. भेषजौ स्थ अवं प्रायश्चित्तिरायं तथा करिष्यदो यथा  
 Text in M. M.'s edition. भिषजौ<sup>20</sup> स्व आवं प्रायश्चित्तिरावं तथा करिष्यावो यथा

- { AD. न्वैता नाभितपंतीति तौ परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः  
 A. न्वैता नाभितपंतीति तौ परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः  
 C 2. न्वैता नाभितपंतीति तौ परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः  
 C 4. न्वैता नाभितपंतीति तौ परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः  
 B 4. न्वेता नाभितपंतीति तौ परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः  
 { Ca. न्वैता नाभिनयंतीति त्वै परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः  
 { B 1. न्वेता ॥ तीति तौ परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः  
 B 2. न्वेत ॥ तीति तौ परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः  
 B 3. न्वेत तीति तौ परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः  
 B M. न्वेत तीति तौ परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः  
 C B. न्वेत तीति तौ परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः  
 Text in M. M.'s edition. न्वेता<sup>21</sup> नाभितपंतीति तौ परेत्य सुबंधोर्गोपायनस्य स्वपतः

<sup>20</sup> The mistake भेजो in A.D., A., C 2, and C 4 indicates a closer relationship between these three MSS.

<sup>21</sup> The lacuna after न्वेता in the B. MSS. is important; likewise the coincidences between B 1 and B 2 on one side, and between B 3, B M., and C B. on the other.

<sup>22</sup> सुबंधोर्गो<sup>22</sup> is a mistake that distinguishes the B. MSS. from the A. and Ca. MSS. सुबंधे in C 2 is a mere *lapsus calami*, repeated in C 4. So is गोपा<sup>23</sup> in A.D. and B 4, and again प्रत्तस्य in A.D. Is आहुत intended for आहुत ?

- [ AD. प्रमत्तस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधि न्यधत्तानमित्यादि ॥  
 A. प्रमत्तस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधिं न्यधत्तानमित्यादि ॥  
 C 2. प्रमत्तस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधिं न्यधत्तानमित्यादि ॥  
 C 4. प्रमत्तस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधिं न्यधत्तानमित्यादि ॥  
 B 4. प्रमत्तस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधिं न्यधत्तानमित्यादि ॥  
 Ca. प्रमत्तस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधिं निधत्तानमित्यादि ॥  
 { B 1. प्रमतस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधि न्यधतामित्यादि ॥  
 B 2. प्रमतस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधि न्यधतामित्यादि ॥  
 B 3. प्रमतस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधि न्यधातामित्यादि ॥  
 BM. प्रमतस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधि न्यधतामित्यादि ॥  
 CB. प्रमतस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधि न्यधतामित्यादि ॥  
 Text in M. M.'s edition. प्रमत्तस्यासुमाहुत्यातः परिधि न्यधत्तामित्यादि ॥

I publish in this volume the first portion of the *Index verborum*, and shall publish the second portion at the end of the sixth volume. This index was made before I began the publication of the Rig-veda and Sāyana's commentary, and it was by its help only that I was enabled to make my way through the intricacies of that work. I had at first made a separate index for each Maṇḍala. These ten indices were afterwards copied for me, and arranged as one continuous index. Lastly, in order to remove any mistakes that might have happened during this process, I secured the services of a young Sanskrit scholar, who once more carefully verified every reference before the MS. was sent to Press.

So many scholars engaged in the study of the Veda have seen and consulted this Index during the last quarter of a century that I need hardly say what it is, and what it is not. It is an *index verborum* in the strict sense of the word, so much so that in the rare cases where two words happen to have the same outward form and the same accent, they have

<sup>23</sup> The A. MSS. agree in न्यधत्तानमि° instead of न्यधत्तां. Ca. stands alone with निधत्तानमि°, while the B. MSS. just miss the right reading by the omission of one त. B 3 has न्यधाता°, where the long ā is a blunder of the copyist.

not been separated, although they differ in their meaning and in their grammatical character. The words are given throughout in their Pada form. I had intended to omit all the real Galitas, but I found, after the printing had progressed too far, that they had been left in the earlier Maṇḍalas, and I was therefore obliged to give up my original intention on that point. I believe that all that can be done to secure the correctness of the references has been done, but I am not so sanguine as to suppose that all mistakes have been avoided. I have myself detected several in the portion now printed, and if any of my friends will kindly send me such errata as they may discover while using the index, I shall not fail to publish them at the end of the sixth volume.

F. MAX MÜLLER.

PARKS' END, OXFORD,  
1872.

# P R E F A C E.

WHEN I had written the last line of the Rig-veda and Sâyaṇa's commentary, and put down my pen, I felt as if I had parted with an old, old friend. For thirty years scarcely a day has passed on which my thoughts have not dwelt on this work, and for many a day, and many a night, too, the old poets of the Veda, and still more their orthodox and painstaking expositor, have been my never-failing companions. I am happy, no doubt, that the work is done, and after having seen so many called away in the midst of their labours, I feel deeply grateful that I have been spared to finish the work of my life. But habits established for so long a time, are not broken without a wrench, and even now I begin to miss my daily task: I begin to long for some difficult and corrupt passages to grapple with, for some abrupt quotation from the Śâtyayanaka to verify, or for some obscure allusion to Pânini to trace back to its original source.

It was in the year 1845, when attending the lectures of Eugène Burnouf at Paris, that for the first time my thoughts became fixed on an edition of the Rig-veda and its voluminous commentary. I still see the eager faces of a number of young scholars, sitting round the table where Burnouf was lecturing, with a vivacity, a keenness, a flow of knowledge which I have never seen surpassed. Most of those who then attended his lectures, have since become famous in Oriental literature. I need only mention the late Dr. Goldstücker, the late Abbate Bardelli, and of those who are still among us, Gorresio, Nève, and last, not least, R. Roth. I was the youngest of them all, and though I had published my first book, the translation of the Hitopadeśa, my ideas of Sanskrit literature did not reach much beyond Kâlidâsa's poetry, the epic poems, the systems of philosophy, and the Upanishads. Nothing, I thought at that time, could in beauty of thought or expression surpass the Upanishads.



I had translated some of them for Schelling, while attending his lectures at Berlin, had copied some of the commentaries from MSS. of the Royal Library there, and was thinking of devoting myself to that branch of literature. Well do I remember my surprise when I heard Burnouf speaking of these Upanishads as works of small importance, compared with the older portions of the Veda, the Mantras and the Brâhmanas. Burnouf was lecturing then on the first book of the Rig-veda, prepared by F. Rosen, and published after his death, in 1838. I still possess some of the notes which I took at his lectures, with extracts from Sâyaṇa's commentary, of which Burnouf possessed a complete copy, with passages from the Nirukta and the commentary on the Nirukta, works at that time hardly known in Europe. After a time, Burnouf lent me some of his MSS., and encouraged me to copy certain portions of them. It was hard work at first. I often despaired, and but for his encouragement, but for his frank acknowledgment, that he himself, too, could not always make out the arguments of Sâyaṇa, I should never had the courage to persevere.

My own ambition had not yet risen beyond an edition of the text of the Rig-veda, with extracts only from Sâyaṇa's commentary. No more was really wanted, I thought; and I had Colebrooke's authority for holding that opinion. "The Vedas," Colebrooke wrote at the end of his celebrated essay on the Sacred Writings of the Hindus, "are too voluminous for a complete translation of the whole; and what they contain would hardly reward the labour of their reader, much less that of the translator. The ancient dialect in which they are composed, and especially that of the three first Vedas, is extremely difficult and obscure: and, though curious, as the parent of a more polished and refined language (the classical Sanskrit), its difficulties must long continue to prevent such an examination of the whole Vedas, as would be requisite for extracting all that is remarkable and important in those voluminous works. But they well deserve to be occasionally consulted by the Oriental scholar."

But here I met with the strongest remonstrances from Burnouf. Not only the text, but the commentary, too, he maintained, if they were to be published at all, should be published in their entirety, and after a careful collation of all the MSS. then accessible in Europe. Extracts could never be depended upon, for the most difficult passages would, as usual, be left out, and after a time the work would have to be done again.

At that time, I confess, I was hardly able to grapple with Sāyana's commentary, at least with the most difficult portions of it, nor was there any prospect of my being able to collate the most important MSS. of Sāyana, which were in England. Burnouf therefore advised me to try the Yajur-veda. I copied the whole of Mahidhara's commentary from a MS. which I owed to Burnouf's liberality. But in the end I arrived at the same result, viz. that without a collation of other MSS. it would be impossible to carry out a really scholarlike edition of that work.

My disappointment was great, but I determined not to be beaten. I saw that it was absolutely necessary for me to spend some time in England; and I secured the necessary funds by working hard for other Sanskrit scholars, copying, among other things, the complete text of the Aitareya-brāhmaṇa in Roman letters for the late Baron Eckstein. When once settled in the library of the old East-India House, surrounded by the MSS., not only of the Rig-veda and Sāyana, but of the numerous works constantly referred to by Sāyana, I saw that the plan, first sketched out for me by Burnouf, and I ought to add, by the late Dr. Goldstücker, was the right one, and that it could be realised. I worked on till a portion of the work was finished; and after obtaining the patronage of the old East-India Company, I was able to publish the first volume in 1849.

We are now in 1874; and in writing the preface to this, my last volume, the words used by another scholar return to my memory, and seem best to express what I wish to say: "*Adolescens manum admovi, senex, dum perficerem, factus sum, ut videtur.*" And again: "*Habes hoc opus absolutum serius quam promiseram, et expectabam. Nosti conditionem rerum humanarum. Multa saepe accidunt quae non sinunt nos ad amussim cogitata perficere.*" Twenty-five years are certainly a long time, and when I saw how some of my kind friends clamoured against the delay that had occurred in the publication of Sāyana, though I could not but feel gratified at their impatience, I began to fear that I might really be to blame. I therefore tried to make out an account of my stewardship, and the result was as follows. In looking through my notes, I found that since 1849, there were only three years during which I was prevented from going on with my work; one year, when I was out of health; another, when I had to wait for the renewal of the grant at the time of the extinction of the East-India Company; and a third, when expecting

a MS. which had been discovered in India, and promised to be, if not the original, at least much more ancient than any of those on which I had based the critical restoration of Sâyaṇa's commentary. I cannot deny that during the last twenty-five years, I have also done some other work, in the science of language, mythology, and religion, and that I have not thought, that a man can live, or ought to live, by Sanskrit alone. But after deducting the three years, when it was impossible for me to print, I found, to my own surprise, I confess, that I had published in my two editions of the Rig-veda, the large one with, and the small one without the commentary of Sâyaṇa, what would amount to an annual volume of nearly 600 pages *octavo*, during twenty-five consecutive years. If my friends in Brahma will kindly take into account, that during that time I also published two editions of my History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature; two editions of my Sanskrit Grammar; the Prâtiśākhya, belonging to the Rig-veda, text, translation, and notes; and the first volume of my translation of the Rig-veda, I think they will admit, that I have not been altogether faithless to my first love.

But though on the score of mere quantity my conscience does not smite me, it is far otherwise with reference to the quality of my work. During the last twenty-five years Sanskrit scholarship, particularly with regard to Vedic literature, has advanced so rapidly, that I myself feel most deeply, how much more perfect an edition of Sâyaṇa might have been, if begun now, instead of in 1850. I believe, however, that I did all that could be done at the time, and I fear, or rather, I hope, that an edition begun in 1875, by one of our young Sanskrit scholars, would probably share the same fate in the year 1900. What I did was this. I tested all the MSS. which I could get access to in Europe, in order, first of all, to find out their true genealogical relationship. After I had discovered, that out of the three clearly marked families, none could claim to represent the original text of Sâyaṇa, I determined on the only course that, under the circumstances, seemed possible: I selected in every doubtful case that reading towards which the three families pointed, or from which their divergence might best be explained. In following this course, however, I met with two difficulties. In the first Ashtaka, more particularly, but also in the beginning of some of the other Ashtakas, and again in the commentary on certain very popular hymns, many of the MSS. had been so much used for private study, that they were not only full of

marginal notes, containing corrections and additions, but that some of these had actually found their way into the body of the MSS. themselves. While this facilitated the process of restoring a correct, or at all events, a plausible and readable text, it disturbed, for a time at least, the exact genealogical position of the principal MSS., and thus rendered a strict adherence to the only true principles of criticism impossible. In the first *Ashtaka*, therefore, I contented myself with giving *Sāyana's* text, chiefly from the A. and C. classes; and I feel it my duty to warn future editors of *Sāyana*, if there ever be such, that with the new MSS. that have come to hand since my first volume was published, there will probably be ample room for critical gleanings: partly by a more strict adherence to the principles of diplomatic criticism, partly by a more careful examination of the originals from which the numerous quotations in the commentary are derived. Some passages which seem to require emendation in the first *Ashtaka*, have been pointed out by Professor Weber, Mr. Muir, and others; and I gladly avail myself of the opportunity of examining these more carefully, partly in order to avow frankly, where I have erred; partly in order to show, that in many cases I was not unprepared for the objections that have been made, and that I chose such readings as I have chosen with a full appreciation of all the difficulties by which they seem to be surrounded.

Professor Weber dwells chiefly on five passages in the Introduction to *Sāyana's* commentary where, as he thinks, emendations are necessary. The quotation on p. 12, l. 8, can now be verified from the *Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa* II. 1, 3, 12. It ought to be, यथात्तिये प्रदुताय शून्यावासचायाहार्ये हरंति तादृगेव तत्, "to sacrifice after the sun has risen, is as if one brought food to an empty dwelling for a departed guest." Here I see that the A. class, then represented by the old MS. at Paris, collated for me by Dr. Goldstücker, gives पशून् याया; the C. class, represented by C 1, equally at Paris, gives पशून् यायावसचाय; while B 1. has the right reading, शून्यावासचाय. This is also confirmed by my own MS. Ca., which at that time I did not possess. How little the other MSS. in India would have helped, may be seen from the reading, adopted by Dr. Roer in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, vol. I. p. 13, l. 8, यथात्तिये प्रदुतायासूयावासचाय.

On the same page, line 29, प्रमायुक्ते is no doubt what *Sāyana* ought to have written, and I see that Dr. Roer has adopted it. If I retained प्रमायुक्ते, it was partly because the best MSS. give that reading, partly because I did not know

then the meaning of *pramāyuka*. It is one of the words which Wilson's Dictionary did not supply. In the course of my reading it occurred to me for the first time in the *Nirukta* III. 5, a passage not mentioned in the Dictionary of Boehtlingk and Roth. From its frequent occurrence in the *Brāhmaṇas*, we are now all familiar with the meaning and the origin of the word. That it was not easily intelligible, however, even to Indian readers, may be gathered from my own MS. Ca. Here the passage is given *in margine*, and correctly; but after writing *प्रमायुकः*, the writer himself adds a new marginal gloss, *हिंसायुकः*.

On page 21, line 23, I should have separated *मानयति*, if I had known the passage in the *Taittirīya-saṃhitā* VII. 4, 19; but in that case, I should most likely have corrected *अवे अवाले अविने* to *अवे अवात्यविने*, which is the correct reading there (see *Taitt. Prātiś. XI. 17*), whereas the reading of the MSS. of *Sāyana*, as adopted in my edition, is supported by the *ipsissima verba* of *Pāṇini*, VI. 1, 118; *Siddhānta-kaumudī*, vol. II. p. 510.

In the other passages, where the reading which I adopted has been challenged, it will be seen that I was right, and that my critics were wrong. Thus with regard to *दृष्ट*, on page 34, line 15, Professor Weber has no doubt discovered, since he pointed out the various reading of *दृष्ट* as one of his five necessary emendations, that in writing *दृष्ट* I had adopted the right reading, the passage being an extract from the *Pāṇinīyā Sikshā*, published by himself in the *Indische Studien*, vol. IV. p. 271. Why are not such technical terms as *gītin*, *śiraḥkampin*, etc., given in the Petersburg Dictionary?

There remains the fifth passage, p. 35, l. 6, where it was thought, that I ought to have written *तथाश्चिन्ते*, instead of *तथा चिन्ते*. However, here, too, Professor Weber will have since discovered that I was right; for the *Taitt. Āraṇyaka*, II. 16, from which the quotation is taken, has *चिन्ते*, not *आश्चिन्ते*. *चिन्ते* means, he is left behind, he fails, or, as the commentator explains it, he is deprived of glory, a meaning which does not belong to *आश्चिन्ते*.

So much with regard to the five necessary corrections, for such *aśuddha's* as p. 31, l. 28. *अवदः* for *अवादः*, and p. 41, l. 6. *तद् हा* for *तद् ह*, need not be noticed.

Mr. Muir also had suggested a correction in the Introduction\*, viz. the addition of *न* on p. 4, l. 3, after *इति चेत्*. In a later edition, however, he withdraws his objection, having been informed, as he says, by Professor

Goldstücker that न is often omitted, though understood after इति चेत्. I need hardly say, that it was on the very ground adduced by Professor Goldstücker that, much against my own wish, I decided not to insert the न, which was wanting in the best MSS. then accessible to me. But I must state at the same time, that seeing the न in Roer's edition, and likewise in my own carefully-revised MS. Ca., I should certainly insert the न in a new edition, and likewise put a stop after शरीरित्वात्.

These doubts and difficulties carry me back many years, and though I well remember how I did my best with such a knowledge as I then possessed to overcome them, yet I am perfectly aware and ready to confess that on many points I ought to have decided differently. All I can say is, that those were the days when other scholars wrote of Etendhras\*, or could not distinguish between षाष्टिकमाद्युदात्तत्वं and आष्टमिकं सर्वानुदात्तत्वं†, so that here, too, the Indian maxim might be taken to heart:

खलः सर्वपमात्राणि परिच्छिद्राणि पश्यति ।

आत्मनो बिल्वमात्राणि पश्यन्नपि न पश्यति ॥

Many of the difficulties I had to contend with at first and single-handed, have disappeared during the progress of this work. The MS. Ca., which I owe to the kindness of Professor Wilson, was of considerable assistance throughout. The *Index verborum*, once made, enabled me, in many a difficult passage, to confront the numerous explanations of the same or similar words in different parts of Sāyaṇa's commentary, and thus to discover the drift of his arguments. Many of the books, too, referred to by Sāyaṇa, and which, when I began my edition, I possessed in MS. only, such as the Nirukta, the Aitareya-brāhmaṇa, Āśvalāyana, the Taittirīyaka, and other works, have since been published in more or less critical editions; and last, not least, Pāṇini's Grammar, which in 1847 was still a book with seven seals, has been rendered more and more intelligible by the combined labours of native and European scholars.

But, on the other hand, the MSS. of Sāyaṇa in the progress of my work became worse and worse, so much so that a scholar who was best acquainted with the MSS. at my disposal, declared that a critical restitution of the last books of Sāyaṇa would be altogether impossible. Nor were the editions of the

\* Roth, Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda, p. 133.  
volume of the Rig-veda.

† See note S to the Preface of the first

works to which Sāyana referred, always a help. Before they were published, I felt obliged to restore the text of each passage, as well as I could, partly from the MSS. of Sāyana, partly from the MSS. of the works themselves. After their publication, I had often the additional difficulty of finding out whether the *textus receptus* was to be accepted or to be rejected.

This is a point which will require some elucidation, and I shall therefore give a few instances to show how dangerous it would have been, if I had in every case surrendered the readings of Sāyana's MSS. for the published text of the works to which he refers.

I begin with Pāṇini, the text of whose Sūtras might seem to be the least exposed to critical doubts. Yet it will be seen that I have in several cases adopted a reading different from that of Boehtlingk's edition, and that I have done so for some good reason. In the commentary to I. 9, 2, I adopted at first the reading of B.'s edition, द्वितीयादौः स्वेनः (Pāṇ. II. 4, 34), but in doing so I was wrong. I ought to have followed the MSS. of Sāyana, which consistently give द्वितीयादौः स्वेनः, a form which is not correct grammatically, but supported by an irresistible weight of evidence. I therefore restored that reading in I. 105, 19; III. 9, 5; X. 125, 8. The Mahābhāṣya (p. 402<sup>b</sup>) has the same reading.

When speaking of the two possible forms उणादि and उणादि (Preface to vol. IV. p. lxxiii) I explained the rules which Pāṇini and most grammatical writers seem to have followed with regard to the final letters of technical terms. If what I stated there, is true, and I know of no one who has controverted it, then I could not in X. 68, 7 adopt the reading of Pāṇ. II. 4, 79, as given by Boehtlingk, but had to write instead तनादिभ्यस्तयासोः. The same rule applies to Pāṇ. III. 1, 79, as quoted by Sāyana, I. 19, 8; I. 30, 14, etc.; to Pāṇ. III. 2, 168, as quoted I. 25, 14; to Pāṇ. V. 4, 11; to Pāṇ. VI. 4, 156, as quoted I. 36, 6; to Pāṇ. VII. 1, 2, as quoted I. 6, 4. I was wrong also in I. 3, 1, in adopting at first the text of Boehtlingk, Pāṇ. III. 1, 32, सनाद्यंता धातवः, and I afterwards followed the authority of the MSS., in writing सनाद्यंता धातवः, Rv. I. 8, 4, etc.

With regard to Pāṇ. III. 1, 80, I was doubtful for some time whether I ought to follow Boehtlingk's text, धिन्विकृष्योर च, or the reading of the best MSS. धिन्विकृष्योरच. I saw there was no support for Sāyana's reading either in the Calcutta edition, or in the Siddhānta-kaumudī, or in the Mahābhāṣya (p. 45<sup>a</sup>), yet the MSS. of Sāyana were so consistent that I wrote धिन्विकृष्योरच in I. 6, 3; I. 10, 7; I. 92, 1; I. 117, 25; III. 11, 4; IX. 91, 5; X. 101, 2; X. 128, 5.

It may seem to some critics that I went too far in altering the text of Pāṇini IV. 2, 43, by inserting सहाय. This word, no doubt, falls under the same rule, but it forms the subject of a Vārttika. Sāyana, however, may have mixed up the Sūtra and the Vārttika, and if he did so, it would have gone beyond the duty of an editor to correct him in such matters.

In Pāṇ. IV. 4, 117, Boehtlingk writes घञौ च instead of घञौ च. The च, however, is here not merely euphonic, but marks the accent of च, as we see from Rv. I. 13, 10, चचश्चिन्नादंतोदात्तं. I therefore had to follow the authority of the MSS. in writing घञौ, Rv. I. 13, 10; X. 120, 8.

I was misled twice, Rv. I. 93, 8, and III. 41, 1, by an emendation introduced by Boehtlingk, to write Pāṇini's Sūtra VI. 3, 92, विश्वदेवयोश्च ढेरञ्चतावप्रत्यये. It ought to be विश्वदेवयोश्च ढेरञ्चतावप्रत्यये, and I adopted this afterwards, in accordance with Sāyana's MSS. The Calcutta edition of Pāṇini and the Siddhānta-kaumudī (vol. I. p. 179) give विश्वदेवयोश्च rightly, and Boehtlingk also in his Notes inclines towards it. It is the only possible reading, because there is no such word as विश्वच्. The reading of अंचतावप्रत्यये is more doubtful, because the Calcutta edition of Pāṇini and the Siddhānta-kaumudī give अंचतौ वप्रत्यये, and explain the Sūtra accordingly. Sāyana, however, preferred, as far as it is possible to judge, the reading अंचतावप्रत्यये, which I therefore adopted in IX. 93, 4.

More serious mischief has happened in the case of Pāṇ. VII. 1, 47. Here the text of the Sūtra is quite right, but in the commentary, both the Calcutta edition and Boehtlingk's give दत्ताय instead of दत्ताय. This ungrammatical form, I am grieved to say, has found its way, by an extraordinary accident, into my large edition, for though I corrected it in the Pada-text and in the commentary (X. 85, 33), it has remained unaltered in the Saṃhitā-text. The result has been that it crept into my small edition of the two texts, and likewise into the *Index verborum*. I know, of course, that it could be defended as a license allowed in writing (see Boehtlingk, Notes to Pāṇini VIII. 4, 47), but I should be sorry to avail myself of such an excuse.

In Pāṇ. VII. 3, 57, I believe the right reading would be सङ्घटोर्जेः, or संघटोर्जेः, as in the Calcutta edition and the Siddhānta-kaumudī. I adopted at first the reading adopted by Boehtlingk, सङ्घटोः, but changed it afterwards for सङ्घटोर्जेः. See Rv. IX. 65, 9, seq.

In Pāṇ. VIII. 3, 66, Boehtlingk gives सदिरप्तेः. The Calcutta edition has the same, likewise the Siddhānta-kaumudī, vol. II. p. 37. There may be some



reason why Pāṇini wrote सदिप्रतेः, and Tārānātha distinctly explains it, सदिप्रति प्रयना पञ्चमै इत्याशयेन व्याचष्टे सदेरिति. Śāyana, however, was evidently not aware of any sufficient reason for so ungrammatical a proceeding, and as I had to edit Śāyana, and not Pāṇini, I wrote throughout सदेप्रतेः. See Rv. I. 5, 1; I. 22, 8; III. 14, 2, etc.

I hold by no means that we are justified in altering the received text of Pāṇini, or even of his commentator, according to the authority of the MSS. of Śāyana. Śāyana is not even consistent in his own manner of quoting Pāṇini. Thus instead of तित्स्वरितः, VI. 1, 185, he sometimes writes तित्स्वरितः; instead of नद्यजादी, the dual, in Pāṇ. VI. 1, 173, he sometimes writes नद्यजादिः; instead of इर्यो रे, Pāṇ. VI. 4, 71, he allows himself occasionally to quote the other reading, इर्योः, X. 130, 5.

Frequently, too, Śāyana expresses himself with a briefness which one feels at first inclined to correct, but which one becomes accustomed to in the course of his work. At first I always corrected अविद्यमानत्वं into अविद्यमानवत्त्वं, which is the only correct form. But as Śāyana knew this perfectly well, it became clear to me after a time, that he considered अविद्यमानत्वं sufficient for all practical purposes. See Rv. X. 116, 7. In the same manner he sometimes says स्वरः for प्रकृतिस्वरः. So again in X. 136, 7, Śāyana explains the genitive of विषय्य as an accusative, but having done the same again and again, he does it sometimes more briefly, and says क्रियाग्रहणं कर्तव्यमिति कर्मेणः संप्रदानत्वाच्चतुर्थ्ये षष्ठी. This, at all events, is clearly the reading of the MSS. in this and in other places (VI. 49, 12), and I saw no reason why I should alter it. What was in his mind was evidently to appeal to the Vārttika, I. 4, 32, 1, for giving to the Sampradāna the meaning of that which can be reached by the action of the verb, and then to quote Pāṇ. II. 3, 6, for showing that the sixth case can stand in place of the fourth. He might have said, पानक्रियया प्राप्यत्वात्संप्रदानत्वेन चतुर्थ्ये; cf. I. 4, 10; VIII. 96, 17; IX. 74, 8; IX. 97, 15; and then have continued, चतुर्थ्ये बहुलं छंदसीति संप्रदानार्थे षष्ठी.

Such passages in which an editor abstains from treating his author magisterially are, as I know from painful experience, the very passages for which the editor himself is afterwards treated magisterially by perfunctory critics.

In Pāṇini's Grammar the text is generally as firmly established as in the hymns of the Rig-veda, and therefore there could be but few passages in which I felt doubtful between the authority of the MSS. and the printed text. This was more frequently the case with the Vārttikas, and it will be seen that

these glosses, as quoted by Sâyaṇa, differ frequently from that form in which they appear in our editions of Pāṇini.

When, however, we come to other works, such as the Uṇādi or Phit-sūtras, the difficulties increase immensely. At first I had only Dr. Boehtlingk's edition of the Uṇādi-sūtras to consult, and with the help of Ujġvaladatta's excellent commentary, I could generally arrive at some conclusion as to what was, if not the original reading, at least that which Sâyaṇa intended to follow. Afterwards Dr. Aufrecht gave us an edition of this very commentary, and thereby reduced very considerably the labour of determining the right reading. Still in many of these Sūtras, Sâyaṇa constantly either adds or omits a verb, which does or does not suit him, and an editor of Sâyaṇa is bound to be guided, in each case, by the respective weight of the MSS. Thus in Sūtra I. 3, Sâyaṇa inserts रहि after चटि, see I. 10, 2; III. 52, 5, etc., while in the editions राहुः is treated as a bahulaka derivative under Sūtra I. 1.

Sūtra I. 23 (24), Sâyaṇa adds दृशिभ्यः at the end, Rv. I. 5, 2; I. 11, 4, etc. It also occurs in the MS. of Ujġvaladatta, but I doubt whether it should have been added in an edition of the Sūtras. Ujġvaladatta himself does not explain it in his commentary, the reason being that he gives it in Sūtra I. 27 (28), where he derives paśu from it. At all events दृशि ought not to be in both Sūtras. In I. 51, 5, Sâyaṇa brings पियुः under the same Sūtra, I. 23.

Sūtra I. 29, Sâyaṇa reads रंचि, in order to explain रचुः. See Rv. I. 52, 5.

Sūtra I. 39, Sâyaṇa reads व्यचेः संप्रसारणं यः किञ्च, and when he explains विधुः in I. 87, 1, he particularly adds बहुलवचनाद्धत्वं न भवति ।. The MS. of Ujġvaladatta has the same reading, व्यचेः संप्रसारणं यः किञ्च ।, and at the end विधुरश्चौररक्षणेः, i. e. रक्षसोः.

Sūtra I. 73 is sometimes quoted by Sâyaṇa चायः को च, see Rv. III. 61, 3. As the same reading occurs in Ujġvaladatta, and as in III. 11, also, Sâyaṇa, III. 34, 3, reads घेट ई च, instead of घेट इच्च, I did not think it right to make any alteration.

In Sūtra I. 138, Sâyaṇa changes the last नीभ्यो to णीभ्यो, Rv. I. 5, 1. This seems right, though the ordinary reading नीभ्यो can be defended.

Sūtra I. 150 appears generally as अशिमुपीतादिना instead of अशू°, I. 11, 4; I. 9, 1; III. 9, 6. Another peculiarity in Sâyaṇa's quotations of this Sūtra is that he inserts रणि after लटि, in order, as it would seem, to explain रत्न. Yet, where that word occurs, he explains its etymology differently, I. 65, 3; I. 66, 2.

Sâyaṇa is not always guided by the exact wording of the Sūtras. Thus he quotes Sūtra I. 152, in order to explain the formation of कृष्णः, and, as that Sūtra

explains not कृष्णः, but रिष्णः, he simply changes रिष्ण into कृष्ण, and substitutes व for वन्, Rv. I. 64, 2; III. 32, 7.

Sāyaṇa quotes सयशूभ्यां तदच as a Sūtra, I. 156, in order to explain सन्न, but as in III. 7, 1, he assigns to सन्न the meaning of सपैण्यस्वभाव, he allows by bahulakatva the substitution of सृप् for सप्, and remarks on the irregularity of the accent which, if the suffix be kvanin, ought to have been on the first syllable.

He likewise quotes a Sūtra for the formation of नवन् and दशन्, viz. III. 9, 9, शुद्धंशोर्नदश्च (this is the reading of Ca. too), adding afterwards गुणश्च, which applies to नु, while दश्च would teach the substitution of दश् for दंश्, which Ujjvaladatta accounts for by नलोपः. Soon after, however, III. 23, 3, Sāyaṇa again quotes this Sūtra, but in a slightly different form, viz. तुदशोर्गुणश्च (thus also in Ca.), which is better with regard to नवन्, but not with regard to दशन्.

Sāyaṇa does not consider that when a number of ready-made words are given after suffixes which differ in accent only, as, for instance, रक् and रन्, they are all to follow the accent of the suffix mentioned in the Sūtra immediately preceding. Ujjvaladatta, no doubt, puts this interpretation on the Sūtras, but not Sāyaṇa, nor, if we may judge from I. 23, 1, the Manoramā. Thus in II. 29, he quotes the ādyudāttas, like इंद्रः, as formed by रन्, I. 2, 6; I. 3, 5; III. 10, 9; but the antodāttas, such as कृञ्, क्षुर, भृद्, उय, शुक्र, also तीञ्, he quotes as formed by रक्; cf. I. 1, 6; I. 23, 1. In III. 26, 5, several MSS. have कृञ्जेन्द्रायेति निपातनाद्रप्रत्यय, or द्रप्रत्यय (Ca.), and I believe रप्रत्यय is what Sāyaṇa really intended.

Sūtra II. 61, Sāyaṇa quotes either as हुचः सुवच, I. 12, 6; I. 58, 4, or as जुहोतेद्वे दीर्घश्च, in III. 31, 3.

According to Sāyaṇa I had always quoted Sūtra II. 87, as युजिबुधिदृशः किञ्च instead of युधिबुधिदृशिभ्यः किञ्च. Sāyaṇa explains युजानः by it in III. 43, 6; III. 57, 4. I see that Dr. Aufrecht has दृशः, but not युजि, and in this he is supported by Ujjvaladatta.

In II. 92, too, I am glad to see that Dr. Aufrecht has adopted the reading सुन्यसेर्चन् instead of स्वसेर्चन्; Sāyaṇa's MSS. are unanimous in I. 71, 1; and Ujjvaladatta's reading, twice repeated, viz. सेर्चन्, is of course impossible.

In II. 100 (105), I see that Dr. Aufrecht has changed कृषेरादेश्च चः into कृषेरादेश्च थः, which is, no doubt, in accordance with Ujjvaladatta's view. Sāyaṇa, however, differs, and refers to the Sūtra in explanation of चर्षणि. See III. 37, 4.

In Sūtra III. 2, Sāyaṇa omits ज्ञि, while Ujjvaladatta admits it, a fact not without significance, as I pointed out in my History of Ancient Sanskrit

Literature (1859), p. 249. I also pointed out in the same work, that the Sûtra III. 140, which explains the formation of so modern a word as *dinâra*, i.e. *denarius*, was distinctly mentioned by Ujjvaladatta as not explained in two of the earlier commentaries, and that the etymology of *tirîṭa*, as given in IV. 184, is left out, according to Ujjvaladatta, in the Nyâsa, and, as I showed, in the Mahâbhâshya also. Dr. Aufrecht has added to these spurious words which I had obelized, one more, viz. *mihira*, the Persian *mihr*, in Sûtra I. 51 (52), but much more remains to be done before we can hope to obtain a really critical edition of the Ârsha-text\* of these ancient Sûtras.

It is quite clear from Rv. I. 4, 1; I. 25, 2; I. 92, 10, that Sâyana read Sûtra I. 30, as कृहतिभ्यां कृः. I do not say, that this was the right reading; all I maintain is, that I should not have been justified in altering it.

Sometimes Sâyana's commentary gives Sûtras which are wanting in our editions of the Uṇâdi-sûtras. Thus the word *dharuṇa* is not explained, but Sâyana brings it under Sûtra III. 49, by adding धोरुर्लुक्च, see I. 121, 2. In order to explain योषा, he adds, III. 38, 8, युमुचि after कषि in Sûtra III. 62; in order to explain चक्ष, he adds, I. 66, 5, चक्षि before हसि in Sûtra III. 85.

In Sûtra III. 95 seq. I had altered चायः into चाय्यः on the authority of Sâyana's MSS. This has been accepted by Dr. Aufrecht also; but गृहि, which I had printed in I. 27, 8, and afterwards altered to ग्रहि, I. 91, 3, on account of Pân. VI. 1, 16, and similar passages, he retains on the authority of Ujjvaladatta, as गृहि.

Sûtra III. 98 was given by Boehtlingk as स्तुवः क्सेयश्छंदसि, in support of स्तुवेयं. It was clear that this had to be altered into स्तुवः क्सेय्यश्छंदसि, in order to explain the Vedic form स्तुवेय्यः. But Ujjvaladatta, and with him Dr. Aufrecht, read the Sûtra as स्तुवः केय्यश्छंदसि, in order to explain the word स्तुवेय्यः. That there is such a word as स्तुवेय्यः in Vedic literature, has not been shown; it certainly does not occur in the Rig-veda. But there occurs in the Rig-veda X. 120, 6, the word स्तुवेय्यः as applied to Purandara, and Sâyana quotes our Sûtra in support of it. We must therefore partly return to Boehtlingk's text, and read स्तुवः क्सेय्यश्छंदसि†, the reading which I adopted as at all events the one approved by Sâyana.

Sâyana I. 66, 5, obtains the words दृशीक by modifying Sûtra IV. 17; चरुष IX. 72, 1, by changing Sûtra IV. 74; नहुष in I. 31, 11, by changing Sûtra IV. 76;

\* See Uṇâdi-sûtras III. 91.

† Rig-veda, vol. VI. p. 423, l. 21. Once क्सेय्य instead of क्सेय्य.

मनुष in I. 31, 11, by enlarging the same Sûtra; सूरान् in I. 62, 3, by adding to IV. 85; धृष्टि I. 105, 6, by changing IV. 109; सत्त्वं I. 100, 1, by changing IV. 118. Thus he gains सरिम् III. 29, 11, from IV. 149; हृदिम् I. 50, 11, from IV. 50; मखः III. 34, 2, from V. 23, etc.

In order to obtain चेह् in the sense of पालक, Rv. IX. 74, 4, Sâyana changes Sûtra IV. 104, निषीम्नां रुः into नापोरिन्वे रुन्, supposing that इन्वे, which is a conjectural reading, is right.

I had ventured to alter Sûtra IV. 141, by changing वलि to चरि, Rv. I. 18, 6; I. 36, 6; and afterwards अजि also to चंजि, I. 85, 3; I. 116, 12. I am glad to see both emendations adopted by Dr. Aufrecht, though Ujjvaladatta reads अजि.

Strange mistakes have arisen from Sûtra IV. 209 (207). Dr. Boehtlingk separated the Sûtra and placed part of it in the commentary. Yet he was right in the main, and all that was necessary was to suppress one कनीत्यायां and read चायः कनीत्यायां ह्रस्वो नुद् च वा. This was the reading I adopted where अन्नः had to be explained, I. 112, 24; I. 113, 20. Sâyana does not always quote the Sûtra at full length, and often leaves out the vâ, where it is not wanted for his immediate purpose, as X. 110, 8, compared with X. 132, 7. But whether it is to explain अयः or अन्नः, there is always the proviso ह्रस्वो नुद् च वा. Strange to say, Ujjvaladatta, at least the only MS. of Ujjvaladatta which I know, takes an independent line and writes ह्रस्वनुद् च वा. The Sandhi here leaves no doubt that नुद् is meant, though in the commentary the न in अन्नः might be taken for an न्. Dr. Aufrecht adopts the reading of नुद् instead of नुद्, and what has been the result? A word अन्नः, which nowhere occurs, has found its way, first as a various reading into the Petersburg Dictionary, then as a real and independent word into other Dictionaries, and while the Upâdi-sûtras are made to lend their authority to this sky-lotus, the old Vedic word अन्नः disappears from their list. Only one Dictionary, which is not infected by the ordinary sequacity of Dictionary-makers, the Vâchaspatya of Târânâtha, does not recognise the word अन्नः, but refers to our Sûtra as the warranty for अन्नः.

With regard to the text of the Nirukta, I shall confine my remarks to the first six books of Yâska's commentary, which Professor Roth, though not quite correctly, calls the Naigamakâṇḍa. How much I appreciated the edition of that work by Professor Roth, how much my own labour in restoring the numerous quotations which Sâyana gives from the Nirukta was simplified by it, I have already declared on several occasions. Yet what applies to Pāṇini

and the Unâdi-sûtras, applies also to the Nirukta. I could not trust myself to quote from the edited text, I could not correct Sâyana's quotations, even when they seemed less trustworthy than the printed text, and I had in each case to satisfy myself from the evidence supplied by the three families of Sâyana's MSS., whether he meant to quote the text, such as we now have it in our edition of the Nirukta, or whether he did not.

I. 94, 7, Sâyana quotes from the Nirukta III. 11. He writes दूरेऽपि सन्नतिक इव सन्दृश्यसे, and this seems better than सन्दृश्यसे in Roth's edition.

I. 115, 4, Sâyana in quoting Nir. IV. 11, writes वासरं instead of वेसरं, the reading of the MSS. adopted by the commentators and by Roth. I have little doubt that वेसरं is the right reading in the Nirukta\*, but judging from what precedes the quotation, I feel equally certain that Sâyana wrote वासरं. Ca. also reads वासरं.

Quoting from Nirukta IV. 15, Sâyana IX. 75, 5, writes वचनवन्तः instead of वंचनवन्तः, which is the reading of the MSS. of the Nirukta, of the commentary, and therefore rightly adopted by Professor Roth. वचनवन्तः, however, is mentioned by him as the reading of another recension of Yâska (p. 108).

The same remark applies to Nir. IV. 15, where Sâyana IX. 64, 30, reads पृथग्भावस्यानुप्रवचनं, instead of the simple प्रवचनं which was used by Yâska. In quoting, however, from Nir. V. 2, Sâyana is right, I think, in writing वा व्युदस्यंतौ instead of वाव्युदस्यंतौ, as printed in Roth's edition. I am quite aware that Durga reads अव्युदस्यंतौ, but Sâyana does not, and to judge from the meaning of व्युदस्, he is right.

In I. 54, 5, Sâyana quotes Nir. V. 16, and it seems quite clear that he meant to read वनानीति वा धनानीति वा. The MSS. admit of no doubt on that point, and Sâyana himself refers once more to धनानि, when he adds धनानीति पक्षे मेघस्य धनानीति व्याख्येयं. Professor Roth, however, edits वनानीति वा वधेनेति वा, and, as far as the authority of the MSS. of the Nirukta is concerned, he is perfectly justified in doing so. Durga also refers as distinctly to वधेन as Sâyana to धनानि, for he says यस्मिंस्तु पक्षे वधेनेति निर्वचनं तस्मिन्पक्षे वनेत्येष शब्दो मेघवधेनेति योज्यः । उदकशब्दश्च तस्मिन्पक्षेऽध्याहार्योऽभिवर्जनसंबंधात् ।.

\* Devarāja, p. 18<sup>a</sup>, says, यद्वा विपूर्वात्सर्तेर्गीत्यधीत्य-चाद्यधीत्यस्येकारस्याकारः । पृथोदरादित्वात् । विविधं सराणि सृगानि विस्तीर्णानीत्यर्थः । वासराणि वेसराणीत्यत्र भाष्ये स्कंदस्वामी । वेसरशब्दस्यायमेकारस्याकारः । Then follows a more curious explanation: सादृश्येन चात्र वर्तते ।

यथा वेसरो निःपादकगताभ्यां विरुद्धाभ्यां जातिभ्यामश्व-त्वजाया गद्भवत्वजाया संपन्नः । एवं यावद्द्वौ निष्पादकौ पूर्वभागापरभागौ तद्वताभ्यां विरुद्धाभ्यां शीतौष्णाभ्यां पूर्व-भागगतेन शीतेनापरभागगतेनोष्णेन संबंधाद्धेसरसदृशत्वा-द्वासरमिति.

There are numerous differences between the printed text of the Nirukta and Sāyaṇa's quotations which in themselves are of small importance, but which, nevertheless, required in every case very careful consideration. When Sāyaṇa I. 190, 1, quotes Nir. VI. 23, he puts अनवीणं for अनवी; when I. 39, 10, he quotes the same passage again, he puts विभृच for विभृत; when X. 5, 6, he quotes Nir. VI. 27, he puts अनृतोद्यं for नृतोद्यं; when I. 51, 14, he quotes Nir. VI. 31, he puts वसुनानित्यचै for वसुनानित्यत्वाचैः, this being likewise the reading adopted by Durga.

Several deviations from the printed text of Yāska have been observed in the passage Nir. VI. 32, quoted by Sāyaṇa III. 53, 14. Sāyaṇa reads प्रेष्वा वा instead of प्रेष्वा वा. Here प्रेष्वा is decidedly the better reading, and if spelt according to the old fashion प्रेष्वावा, it would easily account for the reading which is now found in the MSS. of Yāska. Durga explains किं क्रियाभिरित्येवंप्रेष्वास्ते नास्ति काः.

Sāyaṇa reads चरणं instead of हर्म्यं. Here हर्म्यं is no doubt the most likely reading, but it was for that very reason that I did not like to reject चरणं, a purely etymological equivalent of चर्म, such as Yāska not unfrequently gives in his glosses.

What is the exact meaning of the next passage, चांडावाणी इव व्रीडयति तत्संभे, I confess I do not see, nor do I wish to question the reading of Yāska's MS., supported as it is by Durga's commentary, and by the use of व्रीडयति in Nir. V. 16. Yet with all this, I cannot doubt that Sāyaṇa wrote तत्सं, and again तन्नो, and that he understood these words, as they are understood by Durga, viz. यदेतेषामन्यतमस्य नीचाशाखाप्रसूतस्य नीचवंशप्रसूतस्य धनं तत् हे मघवन् नः शीघ्रं रंभय ।.

I may here notice a misprint in a quotation from the Taittirīya-prāṭisākhya, which occurs I. 74, 7. Instead of २. ११, I had written २३. ११. At that time neither Professor Whitney's excellent edition of that Prāṭisākhya had appeared, nor that of Rajendralal Mitra, and I had wrongly counted eleven Sūtras instead of nine.

I need hardly say much about the text of the Āśvalāyana-sūtras. It was not published till nearly the whole of my edition of the Rig-veda was finished; and though I do not wish to say anything hard of its editor, Rāmanārāyaṇa Vidyāratna, particularly as he died before his work was finished; yet it will easily be seen, that even in so simple a matter as the restoring of a correct wording of the Vedic hymns, proper care has not been taken, and that in quoting from this edition, no more weight could be assigned to it than

to a good MS. I cannot deny that the quotations from the Sûtras of Āśvalāyana have often been a great trouble to me. At first, where Sāyaṇa gives some indication as to the book and chapter from which each rule is taken, to find the exact passage was easy enough; but in the progress of the work, the finding of the references became sometimes a matter of great difficulty. Take, for instance, the rules quoted in X. 131, 1. The first and second cases were easy, because the verse अथ प्राचः is actually given; but in the third case, where the initial words of the hymn are not quoted, nothing but a knowledge of the system followed by Āśvalāyana and a good deal of patience were of any avail.

It is different with the Grihya-sûtras of Āśvalāyana, of which we now possess a really critical edition by Professor Stenzler. In some places, where I thought I should have to deviate from his text, I always found in the end that he was right. Thus in quoting from the Grihya-sûtras I. 7, 17, I thought at first that Sāyaṇa gave the right reading, by adding अथास्या योक्तं विचृतेत्, but there is no authority for it in any of the MSS., and I cannot but think that, for once, Sāyaṇa must have referred to another Grihya-sûtra.

Again, when Sāyaṇa X. 103, quotes from Āśvalāyana III. 12, the Sûtra अथैनमन्वीक्षीताप्रतिरयशाससौपर्यैः, I was surprised to find in Professor Stenzler's edition अथैनमन्वीक्षीताप्रतिरये शास सौपर्यैः. I see, however, from a note to his translation, that the mistake had not escaped the careful editor, and that he himself proposes to read अप्रतिरयशाससौपर्यैः. But if that is so, then why is the translation retained, "while he recites the hymn of Apratiratha, the hymn 'A killer,' and the Sauparna hymn?" whereas the correct text can only be translated, "while he recites the hymns of Apratiratha, Rv. X. 103; of Śāsa, Rv. X. 152; and of Suparna." That this is the right translation becomes quite clear by the next Sûtra, where it is said that the hymn of Suparna, which is here intended, is that which begins प्र थारा यंतु, a remark which, as the commentator adds, was necessary, because Suparna is the author of several hymns.

So much for the method which I followed in the treatment of published texts, when quoted by Sāyaṇa. There are other works, however, which Sāyaṇa quotes, and which have hitherto not been published; and these again are divided into two classes, works of which I possessed MSS., and works of which no MSS. exist, or at least of which none could be obtained in Europe.

When Sāyaṇa quotes from works of which I possessed other MSS., I had in every case to determine first, whether Sāyaṇa quoted freely, without binding



himself to the exact words of the author; secondly, whether he followed a different recension of the author; or, lastly, whether the difference between his quotations and the originals from which they were taken, was due to the carelessness of the copyists.

To take a case of the first class. Having not only the text of the Sarvānukrama in different MSS., but likewise an excellent commentary by Shadguruśishya, and another by Jagannātha, I had no difficulty in determining the original reading of that ancient Index, but I was by no means enabled thereby to correct all the quotations occurring in Sāyana. For instance, Rv. IV. 3, some of the MSS. of the Sarvānukrama have *आद्या रौद्री*; in others, these words are inserted at least in the margin. The commentator Shadguruśishya distinctly calls the first verse *रौद्री*, but in doing so he contradicts himself, and forgets that he is explaining, not the Yajur-veda, but the hymns of the Bahvrichas. In the Yajur-veda (see Taittiriya-saṃhitā I. 3, 14, 1; Taittiriya-brāhmaṇa II. 8, 6, 9), the devatā may be Agni, qualified as Rudra; but if the Bahvrichas recognise as the devatā of our verse Agni, *pur et simple*, then the first verse of our hymn cannot be called *रौद्री*, and it would be wrong to alter the introductory remarks which Sāyana makes to our hymn. I am not able therefore to adopt Professor Aufrecht's correction, who assigns the first verse to Rudra\*.

In assigning the deities to the first hymn of the fourth Maṇḍala, Professor Aufrecht and myself are both wrong. I had put Agniḥ, 2-4 Agniḥ or Varunaḥ; Professor Aufrecht puts Agni (1. 6-20), Agni and Varuna (2-5). The text, however, gives *उपाद्याश्चतस्रो वारुण्यश्च वा*, and that means that verses 2-5 are either addressed to Agni, or to Agni and Varuna. Shadguruśishya says, *अग्निवरुणदेवताः शुद्धाग्निदेवता वेत्यर्थः । पुरस्ताच्च परस्ताच्च षोडश शुद्धाग्निदेवता एव ॥* A similar mistake, arising from the neglect of the *vā*, occurs V. 31. Here I had given the deities for verse 8, as 8<sup>c.d</sup>. Indraḥ or Kutsaḥ and Uśanāḥ, 9 Indraḥ and Kutsaḥ; Professor Aufrecht as Indra, Kutsa or Uśanas (8<sup>c.d</sup>), Indra and Kutsa (9). The Anukramaṇi says, *उग्रमिति कौत्स्यौशनसौ वा पादौ परैर्द्राकौत्सी*, and Sāyana explains this rule by *उग्रमयातं सं ह यद्गामिति पादयोः क्रमेण कुत्सोशनसौ विकल्पेन देवता*, i. e. for Pāda *उग्रमयातं*, the devatā is either Indraḥ or Kutsaḥ; for Pāda *सं ह यद्गां*, Indraḥ or Uśanāḥ.

\* अत्राद्या वो राजानमित्येषा यजुर्वेदेऽग्नये रुद्रवत इत्यारभ्य दर्शनाद्गुह्यग्निर्यदेवत्या । अस्माकं तु बह्वृचानामियं शुद्धाग्निदेवत्या । अग्नयेव विशेषणं रुद्र इति । रोह-

यमायत्नाद्गुह्य इति निर्वचनमिति नैरुक्ताः । युद्धेषु शत्रुनादयतीत्येतिहासिकाः । सामवेदे त्वियं भवगतो रुद्रस्यैव प्रतिपादिका सैषा रौद्री संहितेति सामगाः समानन्ति ।

Shadgurusishya says, उग्रनयातमवहो ह कुलमिति पादः कुलदेवत्य ऐन्द्रो वा । सं ह यद्वामिति पादः अश्विनस ऐन्द्रो वा ।

Again, the *vâ* has not been properly explained in VI. 28, 2 and 8<sup>d</sup>. I had put Gauḥ *or* Indrah, Professor Aufrecht puts Gāvaḥ *and* Indra. That I was right is shown by Sāyaṇa's remarks, and likewise by Shadgurusishya, who says, द्वितीयैद्री गवा वा.

In IX. 67, a proper attention to the use of *vâ* will show that verses 25 and 26 do not belong to Agniḥ *and* Savitâ, or 27 to Agniḥ *and* the Viśve Devâḥ, as Professor Aufrecht stated, but that verses 23–27 are either all assigned to Agniḥ, or 25 to Agniḥ *or* Savitâ, 26 to Agniḥ *or* Agniḥ and Savitâ, 27 to Agniḥ *or* the Viśve Devâḥ.

There is another divergence between the Anukramanî and Sāyaṇa in VI. 48, 22. The Anukramanî says, मारुतोऽन्ता द्यावाभूम्योर्वी पृथ्वी, which shows that its author assigned three (20, 21, 22), not two (20, 21), verses at the end of the hymn to the Marutas, while the last verse would be assigned either to the Marutas or to Dyāvābhûmî or to Pṛisniḥ. The style of the Anukramanî is here peculiar, and possibly the two *vâ*'s may have been intended to show that in the first Pâda the Dyāvābhûmî are optional; in the second Pâda, Pṛisniḥ. However that may be, it is quite clear that Sāyaṇa takes an independent view, for he says at the end, विंशयेकविंशोः पृथ्वीसूक्तमित्युक्त्वा मरुतां माता पृथ्वीदेवता । द्वाविंश्यनुष्टुप् । सा चापि पृथ्वीदेवता द्यावाभूमिदेवता वा; i. e. because it has been said that the whole hymn is addressed to Pṛisniḥ, therefore the 20th and 21st verses belong to her, and the 21st to her or Dyāvābhûmî. The writer of one of the MSS. of Shadgurusishya's commentary has evidently been struck by this divergence, for he first of all puts a marginal note to अनुष्टुप् मारुतो, viz. अनुष्टुप् द्यावाभूम्योरिति संहिताभाष्ये पाठः ।, thus admitting a various reading of Sāyaṇa's for the Anukramanî, and then continues, quoting the very words of Sāyaṇa, विंशयेकविंशोः पृथ्वीसूक्तमित्युक्त्वा मरुतां माता पृथ्वीदेवता इति तस्य तत्त्वार्थश्च ॥ The state of the case therefore is this: we may either follow the Anukramanî, and in that case 20–22 are assigned to the Marutas *or* to Dyāvābhûmî *or* to Pṛisniḥ (in succession); or we may follow Sāyaṇa, and in that case 20 and 21 belong to Pṛisniḥ, while 22 belongs to Pṛisniḥ *or* Dyāvābhûmî.

In VII. 104, 23, the Anukramanî says, मा नो रक्ष इत्युषेरात्मन आशीरुत्तरोऽर्थैः पृथिव्यन्तरिक्षदैवतः. The commentator explains this, मा नो रक्षो अग्नि नडिति त्रयोविंश्याः पूर्वोऽथर्व आत्मनो वसिष्ठस्याग्नीः प्राचीना । उत्तरः पृथिवी नः पार्थिवीदिति पृथिव्यन्तरिक्षदैवतः. This, at least, is the reading of MS. W. 379. But MS. E. I. H. 1823 reads in the text of the Anukramanî

उत्तरोऽधर्चः पृथिव्यंतरिक्षद्यौरितिदेवतः, and in the commentary उत्तरः पृथिवी नः पार्थिवादिर्न पृथिव्य-  
तरिक्षं द्यौरितिदेवतः. Dyauh, however, is not invoked in this verse, and cannot  
therefore be its devatâ, nor does Sâyana support that view. The mistake  
must have arisen from the occurrence of the word divyât, but this is not  
sufficient to admit Dyauh as the real devatâ of that verse, as, I see, Professor  
Aufrecht has done.

It is, however, not always so easy to determine whether Sâyana is right,  
or Shadguruśishya, or the author of the Anukramaṇī. In X. 59, for instance,  
the question arises, whether the first Pâda of verse 10 should be assigned to  
Dyâvâprithivyau or Indrah, or to Dyâvâprithivyau and Indrah. Sâyana takes  
the latter view, for he reads the end of the Anukramaṇī as समिद्धेर्तोद्रे चार्धर्चन, and  
in his commentary assigns that Ardharcha to Indrah, after having first assigned  
8-10 to Dyâvâprithivyau. But the MS. of Shadguruśishya (E. I. H. 1823) reads  
once at least च instead of च, while MS. W. 379 had originally च in both places  
where it occurs, but altered it twice to च. In cases of this kind I generally  
follow Sâyana, while I see that Professor Aufrecht reads च, and therefore  
translates rightly Dyâvâprithivyau or Indrah.

In X. 167, Sâyana takes no account of the vâ in his introductory remarks,  
but he fully explains it afterwards, by saying तृतीया लिङ्गोक्तदेवता वेति । पञ्च इन्द्र एव  
देवताये तु निपातभाज इति वाशब्दस्यार्थः. I have, therefore, left the devatâ of the last verse  
optional, while Professor Aufrecht assigns it definitely to the Liṅgoktadevatâh.

No doubt, this conflict of evidence between the text of Sâyana and the text  
of the works quoted by him is frequently very perplexing, yet it is better than  
when we have to deal with Sâyana's quotations from works of which we have  
no MSS. at all. Here it became frequently impossible to restore a readable  
text, and all that could be done was to apply most strictly the rules of  
diplomatic criticism. Sâyana's quotations from the Śât्यâyanaka have become  
almost proverbial among Sanskrit scholars, and those who wish to know the  
straits to which I was sometimes driven by them, may consult the Preface to  
the fifth volume. It is curious that of this Śât्यâyanaka which Sâyana quotes  
so frequently, no MSS. should have been obtainable. Another Brâhmaṇa  
quoted by Sâyana of which I had no complete MS. is the Kaushîtaki-brâhmaṇa  
VI. 46, 3; while others, such as the Aitareya (asmad-brâhmaṇa I. 164, 31),  
Taittiriya, Tândya, and Śatapatha-brâhmaṇa, though not accessible at first,  
have all been published during the last twenty-five years.

Of his own works Sāyaṇa quotes the Dhātuvṛtti, I. 42, 7; I. 51, 8 (asmābhir dhātuvṛttāḥ uktam), and the Nyāyamālāvistara. The latter work is quoted frequently in the Preface, as Saṅgrahaśloka (pp. 11, 19, 20, etc.). The commentator speaks of it in the third person, pp. 21, 22; and in one passage, X. 125, 2, he speaks of its author as Bhagavān Bhāṣyakāra, a title which he could hardly have applied to himself. When speaking of himself, he uses the name Sāyaṇāchārya, Śrīsaṇāchārya, Sāyaṇārya, Sāyaṇāmātya, Śrīmatsāyaṇamantriśaḥ (IV. 58); once he calls himself the son of Śrīmatī, VIII. 46, init.; once the son of Śrīmāyaṇa, VIII. 68, init., and the pupil of Vidyātīrthaguru\* (IV. 58). In one place, of which I had to speak already, the commentary is ascribed to Saṅgama, IX. 13, init. Another curious passage in which Sāyaṇa adopts an explanation different from that of Mādhavabhaṭṭa, has been discussed by me in the *Academy*†. It

\* The predecessor of Vidyāraṇya at Śrīngēri is, as the author of the Pañchadaśī, called Bhāratīrtha-vidyāraṇya-muniśvara. A picture of him is given in the edition of the Adhikaraṇamālā, a work which is called Śrīmad-bhāratīrtha-muniprapitā, though the author reveres in the introduction the Paramātmā śrīvidyātīrtharūpt. Both these works are also ascribed to Mādhava.

† I subjoin two letters on the subject from the *Academy*, without entering here more fully into the disputed question whether Sāyaṇa is but another name of Mādhava Vidyāraṇya, or whether Sāyaṇa was the brother of Mādhava Vidyāraṇya. Without denying the weight of Mr. Burnell's arguments, I still hold to the opinion that Sāyaṇa was the brother of Mādhava, the latter living retired from the world, the former being his literary representative. But as more evidence on this question is expected from India, it would be premature to say anything definite at present.

*Parks End, Oxford, Jan. 26, 1874.*

In the edition of the Vamśabrahmaṇa (The Vamśa-brahmaṇa, being the eighth Brāhmaṇa of the Sāma-veda, edited by A. C. Burnell. Mangalore, 1873) Mr. Burnell has tried to solve a problem which has puzzled Sanskrit scholars for many years, viz. the mutual relations of the three commentators on the Rīg-veda, Vidyāraṇya, Mādhava, and Sāyaṇa. I had myself, twenty years ago, corresponded with some of the Pandits at Benares on the subject; but though, after what they wrote, I was satisfied that Vidyāraṇya

was only another name for Mādhava, I never could understand the connection between Mādhava and Sāyaṇa, and therefore abstained from expressing any opinion on the subject. Now Mr. Burnell has solved the problem, or at all events proposed a solution which would remove many difficulties. He maintains that not only Mādhava and Vidyāraṇya, but Mādhava and Sāyaṇa, too, are all one and the same person, that Sāyaṇa was the ordinary, Mādhava the more sacred name of the Guru of Śrīngēri, and that the peculiar nomenclature which allowed Sāyaṇa to speak of himself as the younger brother of Mādhava, though being one and the same person, has to be explained by a reference to Vedānta theories.

I confess that this explanation would remove many difficulties, yet it does not remove all. What shall we say when Sāyaṇa, after having given his own interpretation of a Vedic verse, quotes a different one of Mādhavabhaṭṭa? In the hymn X. 86 there is considerable uncertainty as to the persons to whom each verse is to be assigned. The first verse is explained by Sāyaṇa as being spoken by Indra. But after having done so, he adds, Mādhavabhaṭṭas tu vi hi sotor ityesharg indrāṇyā vākyam iti manyante; tasmin pakṣe tv asyā rīcho 'yam arthaḥ, "The Mādhavabhaṭṭas think that this verse is the speech of Indrāṇī, and according to this view the meaning of the verse would be as follows, etc."—Who can this (or these) Mādhavabhaṭṭa's be?

In his commentary on the Baudhāyana-sūtras, Sāyaṇa calls himself Sāyaṇāchāryapadābhishikta, and

appears likewise from Sāyaṇa's preface, that before he attempted the expla-

Sṛiṅgaṇāchāryasutāgraganyah, i. e. the best of the sons of the Āchārya of Sīṅgaṇa, while in the Yājñatantrasudhānidhi, when he is no longer the family Guru of Bukka, but of Harihara, the son (tanūja) of Bukka, he calls himself the son of Māyana, and speaks of Mādhava as his real brother, saying, Upendrasyeva yasyāsīd indrah sumanasahpriyah, mahākratūnām āhartā Mādhavāryah sahodarah, "He whose brother was Mādhavārya, the offerer of great sacrifices, beloved by the gods, an Indra, as it were, to an Upendra (i. e. to myself)." I do not mean to say that even these passages would resist a Vedāntist explanation, but I should like to know how, according to the Vedāntists of Sṛiṅgēri, it is to be applied. The question is one of great importance, and Mr. Burnell, living so near the monastery of which Sāyaṇa was the head, is probably the only person who could clear up our doubts.

There is little more to be said about Mr. Burnell's valuable Introduction. As Mr. Burnell is engaged in searching for MSS. of commentaries on the Rīg-veda, anterior to Sāyaṇa's, I may mention that, besides those which I referred to in my History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, and in the Prefaces to my edition of Sāyaṇa, I possess a considerable portion of Jayatīrthabhikṣhu's gloss on Ānandatīrtha's Rīg-bhāṣya, and Ātmānanda's commentary on the Vāmiya-sūkta. I should also like to call Mr. Burnell's attention to a statement made in 1846 by the Pandits of Benares, that Mādhava wrote a commentary on the Atharva-veda-saṃhitā, and that it consisted of 80,000 lines. Although there is little hope of recovering it, yet when the exact extent of the work is given, we can hardly doubt that it once existed. (See my Introduction to the Science of Religion, p. 109.)

*Parks End, Oxford, April 6, 1874.*

In answer to my letter of January 26, printed in the *Academy* of January 31, Mr. Burnell writes to me from Mangalore, March 10, telling me that he has been unable, as yet, to visit the College of Sṛiṅgēri, of which Sāyaṇa, the author of the great commentary on the Rīg-veda, was once the Warden, and where the tradition of his teaching is still kept up.

"I hoped," he says, "to be able to show you how highly I valued your kindness, by getting some more information from Sṛiṅgēri, but in this I have unfortu-

nately not succeeded, owing to the prolonged absence of the Guru on a begging tour.

"The passage you quote about Mādhava Bhaṭṭa is very interesting. I have no doubt (as Bhaṭṭa is used) that this man was perhaps the rival of Sāyaṇa, for in South India this title is by no means complimentary. I hope to find some traces of him, but must write to you again on the subject. Mādhava is so common a name in South India that it is impossible to suppose any Vedāntist allegory in this case; nor, if Sāyaṇa had a real brother called Mādhava, would he have spoken of him in this way.

"Jayatīrthabhikṣhu's gloss is not uncommon; the author was a monk of Ānandatīrtha's (i. e. Madhva's) sect, and lived S. 1190-1254. He was the fifth in succession to Madhvāchārya or Ānandatīrtha. There are six MSS. of the whole (?) or parts at Tanjore, but I did not mention it, as it seemed to me purely sectarian.

"It is very uncertain how much of the Rīg-veda Ānandatīrtha commented on. I have only seen a small tract containing the beginning, and it is always spoken of by the Brahmans of that sect as a small work. One, however, at Conjeveram, some six years ago, told me that he had seen a MS. which was as big as two volumes of your edition of Sāyaṇa, but I doubt this much, as he never could produce it.

"For the same reason I doubt the report of the Benares Brahmans to Dr. Muir about an Atharva-veda commentary. I have so often had tales told me quite as precise which I have ascertained afterwards to be untrue, that I am very little inclined to believe mere assertions.

"The best Pandits all accept my view of the Mādhava Sāyaṇa question. There are no Pandits, I hear, at Sṛiṅgēri, and very few Brahmans there who know any Sanskrit at all.

"When the Guru returns I shall visit the place, and do my best to get you a transcript of some of the Rīg-veda commentary there, at all events."

I have only one remark to make. When Sāyaṇa speaks of Mādhava, he calls him generally Mādhava, Mādhavārya or Mādhavāchārya, not Mādhavabhaṭṭa. But if Bhaṭṭa or Bhaṭṭas (plural) is now in South India a title by no means complimentary, was it so at the time of Sāyaṇa? There are so many names formed like Mādhavabhaṭṭa, that one can hardly

nation of the Rig-veda, he had explained the Taittirīya-saṃhitā, the Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa, and the Taittirīya-āraṇyaka\*.

Sāyaṇa refers but seldom to former commentators on the Rig-veda. Those whom he does mention do no longer exist, or, at all events, no MSS. of them have ever yet reached Europe. It is more than doubtful, even, whether any of them were real commentaries on the Rig-veda. Sāyaṇa mentions Bhaṭṭa-Bhāskara Miśra. In I. 63, 4, he quotes him for his explanation of पराचैः; in I. 71, 4, he refers to his etymology of ज्ञेयः by means of an aupādika suffix; in I. 84, 15, he gives his explanation of क्षपीचः; and in VII. 1, 7, he appeals to him for the meaning of चतुर्ति. These quotations†, however, need not refer to a commentary on the Rig-veda. It is different with the quotation which occurs in VI. 1, 13. Here he contrasts Bhaṭṭa-Bhāskara Miśra and Bharatasvāmin, both explaining the word vasutā, the latter as having the termination of the locative, the former as one word, used in the vocative case. Still even this does not prove that Bhaṭṭa-Bhāskara Miśra wrote a commentary on the Rig-veda. There is a commentary by Bhaṭṭa Kauśika Bhāskara Miśra‡ on the Taittirīyaka still in existence, and Sāyaṇa, who used it largely in his commentaries on the Taittirīyaka, may likewise have quoted from it here. Devarāja, who mentions Bhāskara Miśra, ascribes to him a Vedabhāṣya, without, however, restricting it to any Veda in particular.

Bharatasvāmin is known as the author of a commentary on the Pūrvārchika of the Sāma-veda§, written, it is supposed, at the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century. He also is quoted by Devarāja, but again only as the author of a Vedabhāṣya in general, so that he, too, need not be considered as having written a commentary on the Rig-veda.

Another commentator mentioned by Sāyaṇa is Skandasvāmin. In I. 88, 5, Sāyaṇa quotes his etymology of varāhu; in V. 12, 3, his view of the origin of navedas. Neither passage would enable us to assert that Skandasvāmin wrote a commentary on the Rig-veda, particularly as both these words would most likely be treated by him in his Niruktaṭikā. To judge from other passages,

suppose they were, at the time, not complimentary. The great Bhaṭṭa, Kumārila, is perhaps more correctly called Bhaṭṭa Kumārilasvāmin, but in Ānantabhāṭṭa, Āryabhāṭṭa, and other names, bhaṭṭa always stands at the end. In the Boethlingk and Roth Dictionary Bhaṭṭa is mentioned as commonly meant for great

scholars, and as distinct from bhaṭṭa, a mixed caste, chiefly occupied with composing panegyrics.

\* See Burnell, Vamśabrāhmaṇa, Preface, p. xviii.

† See also note to I. 189, 2.

‡ Burnell, I. c. p. xxvii, and Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. p. 12. § Burnell, I. c. p. xxviii.

however, it is not impossible that the Vedabhâshya, assigned to him by Devarâja, may have been a commentary to the Rig-veda\*.

Udgîtha, too, who is quoted by Sâyaṇa X. 46, 5, is most likely the author of a commentary, and spoken of as such by Âtmânanda†.

There is, lastly, a work by Kapardin, quoted I. 60, 1. Kapardisvâmin is chiefly known by his commentary on the Âpastamba-sûtras‡, and though it is not certain that this is the book referred to by Sâyaṇa, yet we see from other passages that Sâyaṇa, living in the South of India, where “even the house-cats know the Yajur-veda§,” was most familiar with the ceremonial of the Taittirîya-schools. Thus when in I. 97, init. he quotes Bhâradvâja, we can hardly doubt that he refers to the Śrauta-sûtras of Bhâradvâja, belonging to the Taittirîyas||. He quotes Âpastamba's Sûtras, IV. 9, 5; IV. 58, 3; V. 56, 9; the Hâridrāvika, a Brâhmaṇa belonging to the Maitrâyaṇîyas¶, V. 40, 8. We saw already that he quotes the Taittirîya-prâtisâkhyâ, and in X. 50, 5, he clearly refers to the Pada-text of the Taittirîyas, and to Yâska's Nighaṇṭu III. 12. The passage given in MS. C. (III. 20, 3) has already been discussed.

Instead of quoting his predecessors by name, Sâyaṇa more frequently refers to them in a general way. Thus I. 161, 6, he quotes केचन, without saying who they are, and expresses his dissent from them\*\*. In III. 20, 3, one MS. at least quotes पूर्वे भाषकृतः. The remark is intended for the various reading धाम in the Taittirîya-saṃhitâ III. 1, 11, 6, instead of नाम as in the Rig-veda. The reference to the सूत्रकृन् might be to Âpastamba, whose commentary by Kapardin was mentioned before. Sometimes Sâyaṇa introduces various opinions by अन्य आह, अपर आह, कश्चिदाह, etc. For instance, VI. 42, 2; VII. 87, 4; VII. 57, 3. Sâyaṇa also quotes संप्रदायविदः. In III. 55, 12, he cites their authority in support of the meaning of सवः; in VI. 9, 2, he quotes two of their ślokas in answer to the questions asked in the hymn, and contrasts their view with that of the Âtmavidah. In I. 88, 1, we find him, though at second hand, appealing to the Vṛiddhânuśâsanam††, in opposition to the Paurâṇikas (see also V. 52, 17); and in

\* See History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 240, note 1.

† See History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 240, note 1.

‡ History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 380, note; Burnell, Catalogue, p. 21.

§ Burnell, Vamśabrâhmaṇa, p. viii.

|| History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 199.

¶ History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 370.

\*\* Sometimes corrections made by the copyists on the margin are introduced by vastutas tu, “but in reality.” Some of these find their way into the text.

†† This means the teaching of the old people, for वृद्ध is only used of persons, not of things. I mention

VIII. 33, 6, he says *इमं युद्धमिति वृद्धा वदन्ति*. In the same manner he appeals frequently to the Nairuktas and Aitihāsikas, I. 64, 8; to the Śābdikas, IV. 58, 3; and to others, *Apare*.

There are still a few books quoted by Sāyaṇa, which may here be mentioned. He quotes the Mahābhāṣya by name, VI. 66, 9, but not for the purpose of grammatical analysis. For that he quotes Pāṇini and the Vārttikas.

It is interesting to see that, once at least, Sāyaṇa quotes the Kāśikā, X. 115, 7. There is a verse mentioned in the Śabdakaustubha and the Manoramā, stating that Mādhava re-established the reputation of Vāmana, the author of the Kāśikā, a reputation which for a time had been eclipsed by Vopadeva. *वोपदेवमहाग्राह्यस्तो वामनदिग्गजः । कीर्तिरेव प्रसंगेन माधवेन विमोचितः ॥ इति शब्दकौस्तुभ-नोरमयोरुपलभ्यमानश्लोको नखिलवैदिकभारतीतत्त्वार्चप्रकाशकभाष्यकारमाधवाचार्यतस्ततोऽपि प्राचीनाद्वोपदेवाचार्यतश्चापि काशिकाकारस्य प्राचीनत्वस्य निरूप्येन . . . ।\**

It is of importance, therefore, to observe that Sāyaṇa, though never quoting Vopadeva, does quote the Kāśikā, and likewise two of the most famous commentaries on the Kāśikā. I see no reason to doubt that Haradatta, whom Sāyaṇa quotes, is the author of the Padamañjarī. He is quoted in a passage

this, because in the Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, vol. VII. p. 599, I find the following "Correction" (Berichtigung) addressed to me by Professor Weber: "I have seen with great interest the beautiful communication of our M. Müller with reference to an edition of the Mahābhāṣya, prepared at Calcutta. . . . It is all the more painful to meet in this communication with a passage, which, being misunderstood, as it seems to me, by our friend, might serve to lower our opinion of the value of the grammatical speculations of the Hindus. On p. 168 we read, 'The language of society (bhāṣhā) is explained by Nageśa as that which is used in the transactions of grown-up people, receiving or giving orders.' The Sanskrit text is *भाषा प्रयोज्यप्रयोजकवृद्धव्यवहारः । तत् प्रयुज्यमानानामित्यर्थः* 1. In this passage, however, prayuj means to use, then to name. Therefore we ought to translate literally, 'Bhāṣhā is old custom of him who uses what is to be used in those which are there used' (bhāṣhā ist alter Gebrauch des das zu Gebrauchenden Brauchenden in den darin gebraucht werdenden); or more clearly, 'Old custom of him who expresses what is to be expressed in those which are expressed in it (scil. bhāṣhā),' (alter Gebrauch des das

Auszudrückende Ausdrückenden in den in ihr (nämlich in der bhāṣhā) ausgedrückt werdenden); or simply, 'The common language is that in which, for that which one wishes to say, such words only are used as by traditional practice are fixed as expressions for the objects which they are to signify' (die gewöhnliche Sprache ist diejenige, in welcher für das, was man sagen will, nur solche Wörter gebraucht werden, welche durch hergebrachte Praxis als Ausdrücke für die Gegenstände, welche sie bezeichnen sollen, fixirt sind)." If Professor Weber will consult the Mahābhāṣya, and the translation of this passage by Ballantyne, he will see that I was right, and his correction wrong. It was known, surely, even in 1853, that vṛddhavyavahāra cannot mean old custom (alter Gebrauch), but only the usage, the conversation, the practice of old, and therefore authoritative people. See the article on Indian Law-books by Professor Stenzler, published in the Indische Studien, 1849, where the titles Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya etc. are discussed. In the Petersburg Dictionary this is rendered by "Yājñavalkya senior."

\* See Bālaśāstrī's Preface to the Kāśikā, Pandit, vol. VIII. no. 94.



I. 1, 5, which, it is true, rests on the authority of C 1. only, and is absent in A 1. 2, B 1. 2; also in Ca., and which by itself would carry little weight. But it is known from Westergaard's Preface to his *Radices Sanscritae*, 1841 (p. iii. l. 18), that the author of the *Dhātuvṛtti*, whether Sāyaṇa or Mādhava, quotes Haradatta Miśra, the author of the *Padamañjarī*, which is an exposition of the *Kāśikā Vṛtti*. And I am still further confirmed in my opinion that the Haradatta, quoted by Sāyaṇa, is the expositor of the *Kāśikā*, by the fact that he is again quoted by Sāyaṇa (I. 82, 1) in company with the *Nyāsakāra*, i.e. Jinendra, the author of the *Nyāsa*, or *Kāśikā-vṛtti-pañjikā*, another exposition of the *Kāśikā Vṛtti* \*. If Vopadeva, who lived in the twelfth century, is the author also of the commentary, the *Kāvya-kāmadhenu* †, the fact that he quotes both the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa*, would place Jinendra at least before the twelfth century; while with regard to Haradatta, the author of the other commentary on the *Kāśikā*, we may at all events place him before Sāyaṇa, i.e. before 1350.

There is one very startling quotation in Sāyaṇa's commentary I. 62, 3. In explaining the formation of उत्तिष्ठा he says उत्साशब्दात्स्वार्थे पृषोदरादित्वेन यप्रत्यय इति निर्यंशुभाष्यं. That passage occurs in all the three families, and yet the quotation is identical with what we read in Devarāja's commentary on the *Nighaṇṭuka* (MS. E. I. H. 1134, p. 70<sup>b</sup>): उत्साशब्दान्पृषोदरादित्वेन स्वार्थे यः । अर्थः पूर्ववत्. It is well known, however, that Devarāja in the preface to his commentary quotes Mādhava, and quotes not only other works of his, such as the *Nāmānakramaṇī*, the *Ākhyātānukramaṇī* ‡, the *Nipātānukramaṇī*, the *Nirvachanānukramaṇī* §, but also his *Veda-bhāṣya*. He calls Mādhava, the son of Śrī-Veṅkaṭāchārya, or in the MS. E. I. H. 1134, of Śrī-Veṅkaṭāchārya, and it is just possible he may distinguish this Mādhava from Mādhavadeva, as he calls him afterwards. What the *Anukramaṇīs* are we do not know; to judge from quotations in the body of the book (p. 5<sup>a</sup>), the *Nirvachanānukramaṇī* seems to have been a kind of *Nirukta*. Certain it is, that they have never been met with among the works ascribed to Mādhava or Sāyaṇa of Vidyānagara. If this distinction, however, between two Mādhavas should seem inadmissible, nothing would remain but to admit, that Devarāja knew the commentary of Mādhava, but not in that form in which it was edited by Sāyaṇa.

\* Colebrooke, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. ix.

† Westergaard, l.c. p.v; Aufrecht, *Catalogue*, p.176.

‡ I write *ākhyāta*, for although *t* and *n* are difficult to distinguish, we expect *ākhyāta*, verb, by the

side of *nāma*, noun, and *nipāta*, participle.

§ On the *Anukramaṇīs*, see *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 216. With regard to an *Anukramaṇī* in ślokaś, see Rv. I. 100, 1; X. 62, 7.

We might quote some passages in support of this view. On p. 6, Devarāja quotes Mādhava as giving an etymology of Pūshan, while explaining Rv. I. 23, 13. That explanation, however, does not occur there. Again, Devarāja quotes Mādhava's comment on Rv. VII. 87, 4, but the words do not agree. The case is different, however, in other passages. Thus on p. 20<sup>a</sup>, where Devarāja quotes Mādhava's interpretation of अश्न in Rv. X. 68, 8, he says, अश्नापिनद्धं मधु पर्यपश्यदिति मेघस्य निगमः । माधवपक्षेणायनेव पर्वतस्य; and in Sāyana we read, अश्नापिनद्धं व्याप्या शिलयापिनद्धं. With regard to वेकनाटः Devarāja says, वेक इति द्विशब्दस्यार्थे बहुशो दृष्टः । एकं कार्पापखमृषिकाय प्रयच्छन्तौ मद्यं प्रति-  
दातव्यावित्येवमभिनयेन दर्शयति । ततो द्विशब्ददेकशब्दान्नटयतेश्च वेकनाटाः । एतदेते नाटा द्विगुणकारिणो वा द्विगुण-  
दायिनो वा द्विगुणं कामयन्त इति वेति । द्वेकयोर्नाटाः । नटनं । तद्धंतो वेकनाटाः । मत्वर्षीयस्य लुक् । नटैश्चि नाटः ।  
द्वेकशब्दस्य वेकभावः । This would supply the lacuna in Sāyana VIII. 66, 10.

With regard to metrical matters, Sāyana follows the excellent treatise at the beginning of the Sarvānukrama. He once or twice, however, refers to other works. Thus X. 130, 5, he quotes the Chhandovichiti, i. e. the Sūtras of Piṅgala, with reference to the deities with which certain metres are supposed to be specially connected, the extract being taken from III. 63; and in I. 169, 1, he quotes Piṅgalanāga by name, quoting his Sūtra, विराजो दिशः, III. 5\*.

Sāyana quotes from both Mīmāṃsās, and most largely from the Pūrva-mīmāṃsā in his introduction, and elsewhere. Here, too, the text gives rise to critical difficulties, nor was it always easy to find the Sūtra to which Sāyana referred. To quote but one passage. In X. 129, 7, not one of Sāyana's MSS. gives the correct text of the Paramārsha† Sūtra I. 4, 23; yet after finding the original, I could have no hesitation in giving the words such as they stand in the Vedānta Sūtras.

Apart from these passages, however, in which the authority of the MSS. of Sāyana is more or less checked by the independent authority of the texts quoted by Sāyana, I have throughout followed those principles of criticism which I had laid down for myself from the first. I did not undertake with the MSS. at my disposal to restore in every case the original wording of Sāyana; I only promised to give in every doubtful passage that reading which seemed to me pre-supposed by the various readings of the three families. This is what I should have done, if it had fallen to my lot to carry out the *editio princeps* of a Greek or Latin author, and what would have satisfied the claims of classical criticism.

\* The readings मित्रावरुणौ and विश्वे देवा देवता are confirmed by MS. ख; see Paṇḍita Viśvanātha Śāstri's edition, p. 37, note. See also Rīg-veda-prāśisākhya 957; Indische Studien VIII. 257-259.

† Cf. Rīg-veda-bhāṣhya I. 115, 1.

I do not deny that I was somewhat disturbed, when I was informed, on what seemed to be good authority, that a MS. of Sâyaṇa had been discovered in India, far more ancient than any which I possessed, nay, almost contemporaneous with Sâyaṇa. I naturally waited for a time with my edition, hoping to receive more exact information, but in that respect my hopes were disappointed. It is not impossible, of course, that such a MS. may still come to light, but, as far as I am concerned, I should hardly regret it. I feel certain that the critical method which I have followed, will stand even that severest of all tests; and though I may not in every case have restored the original wording of Sâyaṇa, I believe it will appear, that I have given that text from which the three streams of our MSS. started. I have myself pointed out again and again, that accidents have happened to the text of Sâyaṇa before it reached that stratum, if I may say so, which contains the three sources of our MSS. Whole sentences have been lost, which must have existed in Sâyaṇa's original work; nay, the very fact that they were lost, has sometimes been marked in our MSS. In X. 123, 2, for instance, a lacuna is actually mentioned in the MSS. belonging to the A. class (पंक्तिरेका तत्तास्ति); in the B. class there are dots to mark the accident; while in the C. class only, the commentary goes on as if nothing had happened.

Wishing to know whether the present Guru of Śringêri, the successor of Mādhava, Śrī Nṛisinha Bhāratī, was in possession of materials to supply such lacunas, I asked Mr. Burnell to use his influence with the head of the wealthy College of Śringêri, in order to obtain an answer to some of my questions. I cannot thank Mr. Burnell sufficiently for his great kindness in assisting me in my inquiries; and the result, though far from satisfactory, will certainly be interesting, and, I hope, encourage other efforts. Writing from Mangalore on the 29th of December, 1873, Mr. Burnell says:

"I have lately sent to Śringêri, and the passage on the opposite page is said to be the commentary on one of the test passages you sent me. It appears almost impossible to get information; the Guru is on a pilgrimage, and everybody there is too rich to care for money, nor is there any way to influence these people. . . . Śringêri is at present very unhealthy, and every person from the low country who visits it, gets a bad form of malarious fever. I must, however, try to visit the place, and I am going to send again."

The verse of which I had asked to have the commentary, was X. 27, 9.

The commentary is left out in all my MSS., and in B. there is even a note पतितोऽत्र चर्गर्घः ।.

The authorities at Śringêri supplied the following commentary: सं यमिति वसुक्रात्मनावस्थित इन्द्रस्य सार्वभौमं प्रकटयन् बंधमोक्षयोरालम्बनः स्वातंत्र्यमाविष्करोति । यद्यदा वयं जनानां यवसादो जनानां स्वभूतस्य सत्यस्य सम्यग्ज्ञारो गवादिरूपेणावस्थिता उर्वज्जे विस्तीर्णे गंतव्ये क्षेत्रेऽंतर्मध्ये स्थितस्याहं वयं यवादो यवादिधान्यस्याज्ञारो मनुष्यरूपेणावस्थिता अत्रास्मिन्संसारमंडले कश्चिद्युक्तो योगाभ्यासरतो भूत्वा सुमुद्युः सन् अवसातारं संसारबंधस्य मोचकमिच्छात् । मानेवेच्छति । अथो अपि च वचन्वात् संभक्ताहमयुक्तमयोगिनं पृथग्जनं युनजत् । युनज्मि । वभामि । पुरुषव्यत्ययः ॥

This may, of course, be the original of Sâyaṇa, but we must not be too rash in our conclusions. The comment, as given above, was not copied from a MS., but dictated by the agent of the Śringêri-maṭha, Subrahmanya Somayājigal. Supposing the same lacuna to exist in the old MSS. at Śringêri, nothing would be easier than to supply a comment, like the one given above. Nor would there be the least *mala fides* in the matter. A scholar at Śringêri, being told that an explanation of Rv. X. 27, 9, was wanted, and finding the lacuna in his own MS., would at once supply the required article. Or, suppose the MS. at Śringêri had been used for educational purposes, then again the teacher, on discovering the omission, might long ago have supplied it on the margin, and the marginal gloss might long ago have been incorporated in the body of a new MS. I do not wish to be over-sceptical, but I am as yet far from satisfied that Śringêri possesses MSS. of Sâyaṇa, independent of the three families known to us. It may be, or it may not be, but till I hear more from Mr. Burnell, I should wish to remain entirely neutral on that point. Mr. Burnell says, "I am going to try again, and you may rest assured that whatever information I get, I shall at once communicate to you." The last I heard on March 10, 1874, is that "the Guru is still absent on a begging tour. When the Guru returns," Mr. Burnell writes, "I shall visit this place, and do my best to get you a transcript of some of the Rig-veda commentary there, at all events."

By dwelling so much on the difficulties in preparing a critical edition of Sâyaṇa, I do not wish to produce the impression that the text was corrupt from beginning to end. It is with Sâyaṇa as with other Sanskrit authors: there are long passages which, if we are once familiar with the style of Sâyaṇa, present no difficulties whatever; passages where I knew beforehand almost every word that was coming, and where no regard for the authority of the MSS. would have kept me from restoring the text, such as I knew it ought to be, and

such as Sāyaṇa could alone have written it. Any one accustomed to Sanskrit MSS. knows the accidents that may happen in copying. Instead of दातुं we find शतं; instead of भृशं, चशं; instead of क्षति, श्रुति; ण instead of ष; रा instead of ऋ; रव instead of ख. Owing to the more ancient system of writing the diphthongs, तापा appears for तपो, ताये for तयै, तारे for तरौ, नाद्ये for नद्यै\*. Again, there are many passages where आद्युदात्तत्वं was intended, but अतोदात्तत्वं written; where the Sūtra to be quoted from Pāṇini could only be अन्त्येभ्योऽपि दृश्यते, but where all the MSS. write दृश्यते. There are hundreds of accidents of that kind which, in so large a work as Sāyaṇa's commentary, occur again and again, and which I corrected without a moment's hesitation. Such corrections I have not even marked in the various readings, except when they seemed to throw light on the mutual relationship of the various MSS. I should not wonder if to a casual reader some of these mere routine corrections might seem too bold; but after copying, collating, and correcting Sāyaṇa's commentary for thirty years, I have not the slightest misgivings about them.

And here I may be allowed to make a personal remark. I believe I have acknowledged, without stint, whatever assistance I have received from other scholars during the progress of my work. They themselves have assured me, that I had said more than they deserved or expected. I have never liked the rule, followed by nearly all scholars, of not acknowledging services for which payment has been accepted. But as it has been broadly hinted, that for certain portions of Sāyaṇa's commentary, I had parted with my editorial responsibility, I take this opportunity of stating, once for all, that there is no page, no line, no word, no letter, no accent, in the whole of the commentary, for which I am not personally responsible. Nothing was ordered for press that I had not myself carefully examined and revised; and though for certain portions of my edition, as I stated in the Preface to each volume, I was relieved of much preliminary labour, the decision in all critical passages, whether for good or evil, always rested with me. In an edition of Sāyaṇa, as in an edition of Cicero, there are whole pages which require little or no editorial labour; but the real character of an edition depends on the treatment of critical passages, the more or less frequent occurrence of which constitutes the difficulty of an editor's work.

It should not be supposed from what I have said of the state of the *apparatus criticus* for an edition of Sāyaṇa, that everything could be settled

\* See also Burnell, Vamśabrahmaṇa, p. xxxviii.

by diplomatic evidence. I have already spoken of those regular corrections which, though to an outsider they might seem conjectural, are really self-evident to an editor familiar with his work. But there are other passages, and they are not few in number, where nothing but conjectural criticism would avail, though founded always on the evidence supplied by a proper arrangement of the various readings. Sometimes the mere question of an Anusvāra required the most careful consideration, and the MSS. on such points are naturally of little use. Whether Śāyana, for instance, wrote शंस or शस cannot be settled by diplomatic evidence only, but rather by a close attention to his general style of interpretation. The word अभिशक्ति is derived by Śāyana sometimes from the root शसु हिंसायां (Dhātu-pāṭha 17, 78), sometimes from the root शन्सु स्तुतौ (Dhātu-pāṭha 17, 79). Unfortunately शन्सु is not written in Śāyana's MSS., as it ought to be, with न्स, but with Anusvāra, शंसु, thus making the distinction more difficult, particularly as some authorities assign to the root शन्सु, too, the meaning of हिंसायां.

The word अभिशक्ति, though derived from शन्सु स्तुतौ, has the meaning of imprecation, and lends itself therefore to the interpretation of शाप as well as of हिंसा. Thus we find, Rv. VIII. 19, 26, अभिशक्ति explained by अभिशंसन, and this word itself rendered by निष्यापवाद or हिंसा. This being the case, it is all the more curious that Śāyana, in explaining अभिशक्ति, should quote once only the root शन्सु स्तुतौ (I. 91, 15). This would, in fact, lead us to suppose, that we ought to read अभिशसन and अभिशसक, were it not quite clear on the other side, by the employment of such words as निष्यापवाद, निंदक (V. 3, 12), निंदा (VIII. 66, 14), that Śāyana admitted both derivations, that from शन्सु स्तुतौ as well as that from शसु हिंसायां (I. 76, 8; VIII. 89, 2). Taking all the twenty-one passages, in which अभिशक्ति is explained, together, we find there is none in which, either by the character of the explanation adopted by Śāyana, or by the authority of the MSS., we are obliged to admit the use of अभिशसन or अभिशसक as equivalent to अभिशक्ति. The mere fact that शस्, to kill, is not in ordinary Sanskrit joined with the preposition अभि, would not have sufficed to show that, for etymological purposes, such forms as अभिशसन or अभिशसक could not have been introduced; but I doubt whether there is any but etymological or grammatical authority for the admission of such words as अभिशसन and अभिशसक into our dictionaries.

Sometimes, however, the changes required for a restoration of Śāyana's commentary are of a much bolder character. I shall mention a few, in order

to justify my critical proceedings. In Rv. X. 121, 4, the passage occurs, यस्ये प्रदिशो यस्य वाहू. Sâyana's first idea was evidently to take प्रदिशः in the sense of दिशः, the principal regions or four points of the compass; but he saw that he had to explain यस्य वाहू independently, and wishing to assign to the arms of Prajâpati the place of the principal regions, he recollects himself, and assigns to प्रदिशः the meaning of विदिशः or कोणदिशः, the intermediate points of the compass. I do not say anything here about the correctness of such an explanation, I only try to explain to myself what was passing in Sâyana's mind. Now the state of the MSS. is as follows: A. gives प्रारंभाः अग्नेय्याद्याः कोणदिशः ईशितव्याः; B 4. agrees with this on the whole. The B. class gives, प्रारंभा अग्नेय्याद्याः कोणादेशे ईशितव्याः. The independent authority of Ca. is missing, except the last word दीशितव्याः. As the MSS. are simply unintelligible, I had to ask myself, what Sâyana could have written, and the mention of कोणदिशः made it clear, that he had attempted a distinction between प्रदिशः and विदिशः. The points of the compass in Sanskrit are ten, and they are given in the following order: 1. पूर्वा, 2. अग्नेयी, 3. दक्षिणा, 4. नैऋती, 5. पश्चिमा, 6. वायवी, 7. उत्तरा, 8. रेशानी, 9. ऊर्ध्वी, 10. अथः. As the Eastern point is called not only पूर्वा, but also प्राची, I supposed that the first explanation given by Sâyana must have been यस्य चेमाः प्रदिशः प्राचारंभाः, i. e. to whom these principal regions, beginning with the Eastern, belong. Then, seeing that in his explanation of यस्य वाहू, he had distinctly assigned to the arms the position of the principal regions, भुजवत्प्रधान्ययुक्ताः प्रदिशश्च यस्य स्वभूताः, it seemed to me to follow that he must have allowed another rendering for प्रदिशः, by identifying these with the विदिशः or कोणदिशः, the intermediate points. The first of these being the अग्नेयी, and the last the रेशानी, I now ventured to restore the text by reading अग्नेय्याद्याः कोणदिश ईशानांताः. I should have preferred रेशान्यंताः, but ईशितव्याः would hardly support so violent a correction. Lastly, I was driven to add a वा at the end, in order to get a proper construction, though I confess that the absence of any trace of such a particle makes me doubt, whether, after all, my correction is quite right.

In X. 106, 11, the MSS. stand as follows:

A. गोष्टतः गोरूपस्यव०

B. गोष्टंतः गोरूपस्यंत०

Ca. गोष्टंतरथं धनं वीचतः स्वव०

I leave out the minor differences of the individual MSS. belonging to each class, which may be seen in the various readings. The A. and B. classes still

have traces of what must have been the original reading, viz. गोवन्तर्गोह्यस्ववस्थितं; but suppose we had only MSS. connected with Ca., how would it have been possible to restore the text?

In X. 178, 1, the MSS. give the following readings:

ताह्यं वृह्यं चिष क्षपुचं सवर्णे नृ क्ष यद्वा गर्भादिस्वस्तये A.

ताह्यं वृह्यं चिष क्षपुच सुवर्णे नृ क्ष यद्वा गर्भादिस्वस्तये C Mill.

ताह्यं नृक्षं नृक्ष पचं सुपर्णे नृ क्ष यद्वा गर्भादिस्वस्ताप Ca.

ताह्यं नृक्षपुचं सुपर्णे यद्वा गर्भादिस्वस्तये B 1.

ताह्यं वृह्यं चिष क्ष पुच सुवर्णे नृक्ष यद्वा गर्भादिस्वस्तये CB.

ताह्यं नृक्षपुचं सुपर्णे यद्वा गर्भादिस्वस्तये B 4.

It is clear that this passage has been misunderstood by all the copyists. The corruption must have begun at a very early date, for we see that the commentary to the Sâma-veda, too, shows signs of it. At first sight that commentary seems quite right. It reads (p. 672):

ताह्यं नृक्षपुचं सुपर्णे नृक्षपुचो गर्गादिः स्वस्तये ।

But is there any authority for calling Garga and others the son of Triksa? The only thing which Garga shares in common with Triksa is that their patronymics, according to Pāṇini IV. 1, 105, are formed by the same suffix, viz. यच्. I therefore have little doubt that we must restore the original reading, as I have done, ताह्यं वृह्यपुचं सुपर्णे । वृह्याद्यच् । गर्गादिः or गर्गादिन्वात्.

I have not thought it necessary to give all the extraordinary corruptions that have crept into Sâyana's text, particularly when they occurred in passages, the wording of which admitted of easy restoration. Thus, even without Sâyana, we could easily supply ourselves what he says at the beginning of each hymn with regard to the deities, ṛishis, and metres. But in order to give an idea of what is possible in Sâyana's MSS., I shall give at least one specimen. In X. 132, initio, this is the state of the MSS.:

- |      |  |          |
|------|--|----------|
| A.   | सप्तमी न्यंकुसारिणी द्वितीयद्वादशरात्र्यष्टकवती द्वितीया     | महासाता- |
| B.   | सप्तमी न्यंकुसारिणी द्वितीयद्वादशकत्र्यष्टकवती द्विती आ व्या | महासतो   |
| Ca.  | सप्तमी न्यंकुसारिणी त्वातीया द्वादश अष्टकवती य               | महासती   |
| M.M. | न्यंकुसारिणी द्वितीयद्वादशकत्र्यष्टकवती । द्वितीया           |          |



- A. बृहती अष्टकद्विद्वादशकवती पंचमीषष्ठ्यौ प्रस्तारपंक्ती त्रिद्वादशकद्वष्ट-  
 B. बृहस्पति अष्टकद्विद्वादशकवती पंचमीषष्ठ्यौ प्रस्तारपंक्ती त्रिद्वादशकद्वष्ट-  
 Ca. बृहती न्य ष्टक द्विद्वादशकवती पंचमीषष्ठ्यौ प्रस्तारपंक्ती त्रिद्वादशकद्वष्ट-  
 M.M. षष्ठ्यौ प्रस्तारपंक्ती त्रिद्वादशकद्वष्ट-

- A. कवती शिष्टास्तिस्रो वि-  
 B. कवती शिष्टास्तिस्रो वि-  
 Ca. कवती शिष्टा तिस्रो वि-  
 M.M. कवती । सप्तमी महासतोबृहती अष्टकद्विद्वादशकवती । शिष्टास्तिस्रो वि-

- A. राडूपा एकादशिनस्त्रयो ष्टकश्चेति लक्षणलक्षिताः ।  
 B. राडूपा एकादशीनस्त्रयो ष्टकश्चेति लक्षणलक्षिताः ।  
 Ca. राटूपाः एकादशिनस्त्रयो ष्टकश्चेति लक्षणलक्षिताः ॥  
 M.M. राडूपा एकादशिनस्त्रयोऽष्टकश्चेति लक्षणलक्षिताः ।

Let any one read this passage carefully and compare it with the original text of the Anukramanî, and he will see that my alterations, however violent in appearance, were inevitable.

In many cases, of course, a familiarity with the style of Sâyaṇa is the only means of restoring his text. In X. 177, 1, we have:

- A. ऋक्थे तता तस्य त्तो वद्यं ।  
 B 1. हृदा हृत्स्थेना तात्स्न्या । ता छ च्छं ।  
 CB. हृत्स्थे तता तस्यात्ताच्छब्दं  
 Ca. हृदा हृत्स्थेन तास्या चा छ च्छं

I have altered this without any misgivings to हृदा हृत्स्थेन । तात्स्यात्ताच्छब्दं, but I could only do so because I knew that Sâyaṇa is accustomed to use the expression तात्स्यात्ताच्छब्दं, as, for instance, in IX. 74, 7.

The same remark applies, of course, to thousands of quotations from Pāṇini. They are almost always inaccurate, but with such exceptions as I mentioned before\*, they could almost always be restored either from Pāṇini or from

analogous passages in Sāyana. In X. 116, 7, I must confess that I did not for some time recollect the Sūtra by which Pāṇini fixes the accent of दृश्यं, though the Sūtra had been quoted often before, cf. I. 23, 15; I. 135, 1; III. 21, 3. But any one who will look at the various readings will see, that they did not render much help.

In X. 121, 8, Sāyana writes दधातेहेतौ शानच्. What does हेतौ mean here? Boehtlingk does not give it in his Index to Pāṇini, where he gives the other passages in which हेतुः occurs; yet there can be no doubt, that it refers to Pāṇ. III. 2, 126, where it is said, that participles in शतृ and शानच् are used to express either a quality or a reason, लक्षणहेत्वोः शानच्. Thus शयाना भुञ्जते यवनाः means, the Yavanas (Greeks) eat while lying down; and सन्नैयन्वसति means, he dwells there for the sake of gaining a livelihood. In this sense, therefore, Sāyana wishes दधानाः to be understood; and he does the same in other places, for instance, VIII. 7, 16; X. 122, 2; X. 135, 3.

I trust that these remarks, though they touch on a few scattered passages only, will serve to give to present and future students of the Veda some idea of the way in which I have tried to discharge the trust which was committed to me, of editing the text of the Rig-veda and of the commentary of Sāyana. Mr. Burnell\*, when speaking of Sāyana, says, "Sāyana's position is almost precisely similar to that of the Alexandrian Neo-Platonists, and especially Proclus. Like him, he was a theosophist, and hoped for the restoration by his mysteries of what was fast passing away. He was also, like Proclus, the representative of all the older science of his race, a philosopher, astronomer, philologist, and mystic. Like him, too, he was a laborious, painful compiler, whose industry supplied to some extent his lack of originality. The works of both, therefore, possess only an historical value, and are the best records of the last efforts of an old but decaying form of faith. As such, they call for editions which will preserve them for future enquirers into the history and philosophy of religions; *but the work can be done only once for all, and editors must therefore neglect no precaution to publish these difficult works in as thorough a way as they can with the materials available.*"

I feel the weight of these concluding remarks as strongly as any one. All I can say is, that I have devoted to this work the best part of my life, and the

best energies of my mind. It was often a most tedious work, but feeling, like Mr. Burnell, that so large a work would not be likely to be published again (though who can tell what direction the studies of future generations will take?), I have edited it as if I had to edit Plato or Aristotle. I do not think that the *editio princeps* of Sāyana will altogether escape that fate which has overtaken the editions of the Scholia to Homer, though entrusted to such scholars as Villoison and Bekker\*; yet I trust, that future generations of students will not forget the state of Sanskrit scholarship at the time when I began to prepare my edition, and I may add, the age of the editor, when he first resolved on this work. Were I to depend on the judgment of my contemporaries, even of those who have been most opposed to me, I might indeed be satisfied; but my own mind tells me that, in the early volumes, in particular, future gleaners will find that the edge of my critical sickle has not always been so sharp as it ought to have been, and that it would have been better if the editor of the last volume had been the editor of the first. All I can say is, *δελιοὶ βροτοὶ πολὺπονοί!* and let those who may hereafter discover single mistakes in my edition of Sāyana, bear in mind, that in carrying through the press so extensive a work, it is simply impossible to attain to the same degree of exactness as in publishing an edition of Horace or Catullus, of Kālidāsa or Bhavabhūti.

One foretaste of what future editors of Sāyana may say of me, I have had, and I am glad of it, because it enables me, while I can reply, to show that I might possibly have something to say in self-defence, when I shall no longer be able to do so. The first volume of my edition, in particular, which has been most frequently studied, has been already subjected to a searching criticism, and in such a way as to test, once for all, the soundness of the critical method which I have adopted. Knowing that I had not been able to collate a valuable old MS. of the first Ashtaka, now at Berlin, Professor Weber has published a careful collation of that MS., and we may trust him, that he omitted nothing in order to detect flaws in my text. Here, therefore, is the desired test of my critical principles, and I may say at once, that I believe that, even if the original autograph MS. of Sāyana were hereafter to be discovered, the test would not be either more severe or

\* See *Academy*, July 18, 1874.

more damaging. I proceed, therefore, to an examination of the passages in which Professor Weber has thought it right to mark the various readings of the Berlin MS., and I shall endeavour to show, how little they affect the text as constituted by me twenty-five years ago.

P. 48. ll. 7-11. Professor Weber\* says that the passage from यद्यपि to सिद्धिः is wanting. It is wanting, not only in the Berlin MSS., but in all MSS. except A 2. I retained it on account of its intrinsic value. The MSS. used by Dr. Roer must have contained the same paragraph, but he failed to restore it, because he could not trace the extract back to the Prātiśākhya.

P. 48. l. 19. रत्नानि दधातीति. This is a mere blunder in the Berlin MS.; it can only be रत्नानि दधातीति, as I had printed.

P. 48. l. 21. The Berlin MS. reads स्वरितप्रचयौ. A 1. and B 2. give प्रचितौ, C 1. प्रचितौ. B 1. has प्रचितौ, but प्रचयौ in *margin*. The only MS., therefore, which supports the Berlin MS. is A 2. Hence प्रचितौ must be retained.

P. 48. l. 27. The Berlin MS. leaves out पूर्वभिः and नूतनैः. I added the words in both cases from B 2, not as necessary, but as useful. In Ca., which I did not possess at the time, they are likewise added in *margin*.

P. 49. l. 2. The Berlin MS. reads अवे instead of नवे. अवे was well known to me, for it is the reading of the MSS.; but the passage is a quotation from the Dhātu-pāṭha, and in it no root अवे is recognised in the sense of पूरणे; hence नवे must be retained.

P. 49. l. 7. From नवस्य to चार्त्तिकेन is wanting in the Berlin MS., but added in *margin*. This is exactly what I expected. The original reading was probably नवशब्दस्य नू इत्यादेशस्तन्प्रत्ययश्च महावार्त्तिके विहितः. Then the question arose, what was meant by this Mahāvārttika, the general title of Kātyāyana's Vārttikas? I can find nothing like it in the Mahābhāṣya (p. 77<sup>b</sup>). It was probably for this very reason that another commentator added the usual explanation, viz. नवस्य नू तन्मनष्याश्च इति चार्त्तिकेन. That explanation is wanting not only in the Berlin codex, but likewise in A 1. 2, B 1. 2, and Ca. Professor Weber is wrong in thinking that Sāyana requires तनन्, and by referring to other passages, e. g. Rv. III. 32, 13, he would find, that Sāyana forms नूतनः, though ādyudātta, by तनप्. In fact, I know no authority for the existence of a Taddhita तनन्, except the so-called Mahāvārttika, here quoted by Sāyana.

\* See Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, IV. 265; and, more lately, Indische Streifen, vol. II. p. 9. 1869.

P. 49. l. 13, उदात्तत्वेनैव, and l. 19, संधिद्वायै, are both the right readings, and ought to have been inserted in the list of Corrigenda.

P. 49. l. 21. स्यप्रत्यय° is the reading, not only of the Berlin MS., but likewise of B 1. 2. A 2. has तस्य, C 1. प्स्य; the right reading is probably that of A 1. तस्य स्यप्रत्यय°.

P. 50. l. 3. The reading of the Berlin codex कदाचिदपि स्त्रीयमाणं is not sufficiently supported against कदाचिदपि स्त्रीयमाणं A 2. B 1. Ca.

P. 50. l. 9. I purposely rejected the reading एवादिन्वाद्गोदा°, which occurs not only in the Berlin MS., but also in C 1. A 2. Ca., in favour of the fuller text of the B. class.

P. 50. ll. 15, 16. The passage from ह्रस्व to प्रतिषेधः is wanting, not only in the Berlin MS., but likewise in A 1. 2. B 1. 2. and Ca. It may have been originally a marginal note, as it still is in A 2, but being a useful one, I retained it on the authority of C 1. The same applies to p. 51, l. 4, which is absent in C 1, but supported by B 1. 2. Ca., and partly by A 2, which reads असीत्यत्र निघाताभावो यच्छब्दप्रयागात्.

P. 51. ll. 13, 14. The passage सत्तु साधुः to निपातितः rests on the authority of C 1; it is not in A 1. 2. B 1. 2, nor in Ca. It is most probably a later addition, but it does not belong to the same category as the passage from the Manoramâ. When I allowed a passage from the Manoramâ to remain in the commentary, I felt it my duty to give notice of it in the Preface (p. xxii. note r). Professor Weber asks: "Is Haradatta really a predecessor of Sâyaṇa, or does this addition belong to the same category as that from the Manoramâ?" Unless Professor Weber has some very weighty reason to suppose that the Haradatta here mentioned cannot be the same as Haradatta, the commentator of the Kâśikâ, I do not know what to reply\*.

P. 51. l. 15. The omission of ह्रस्वः after लोपश्च in the Berlin MS. is not supported by the other MSS. The same applies to स्व before प्रत्यय on p. 52, l. 5, and to स्वरत्वे प्राप्ते on p. 57, l. 23. The only various reading of importance is in A 1, which writes प्रकृतिस्वरः । प्रकृतिस्वरप्राप्तौ etc.

P. 60. l. 2. षड्विंशति is right, and supported by A 2. B 1.

P. 60. l. 14. On नष्टजादिः I have spoken on p. xiv.

P. 61. l. 24. The reading of the Berlin MS. इयन् for ऋ is properly marked by Professor Weber with his own sign of exclamation. If Sâyaṇa says राध साध

\* See Preface, p. xxix.

संसिद्धौ, he quotes the Su class, and he can therefore speak of सु only. The only various reading is सु, instead of सुं, in A 2.

P. 62. l. 11. The same wrong quotation from Pāṇini, which Dr. Weber quotes from his Berlin MS., occurs also in B 1. 2. It was impossible, however, to admit it into the text, because the root वृषि does not occur in the Sūtra. If Dr. Weber appeals to a passage in Mahīdhara's commentary on the Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā, where he finds वृषि written instead of वृषि, this is a statement I cannot allow to pass without considerable qualification. Dr. Weber quotes as the authority for this reading, M. M., i. e. a copy which I made at Paris, and which I gave him on *the distinct understanding, that it should never be quoted as an authority*. All scholars will understand why I did this. I had copied the MS. as carefully as I could, but I never collated it with the original, and therefore should never have ventured myself to appeal to it as an authority. But besides this, my copy does not give वृषीत्वा° but वृषीत्वा°, which is, of course, meant for वृषीत्वा°. The whole quotation, in fact, is as much out of place in the Vāj. Saṃhitā, XII. 77, as in our passage. वीरुत् cannot be explained by Pāṇ. VI. 3, 115, but should be accounted for by Pāṇ. VII. 3, 53. The explanation of the mistake in our passage is probably this, that what happened in Ca., happened also to an earlier MS. In Ca. we only find वृषेः क्लिप् पूर्वपदस्य दीर्घः. Then some one added on the margin नहिवृत्तीत्यादिना, to be inserted after क्लिप्; and, lastly, a more careful reader added नहिवृत्तिसूत्रे वृषेरग्रहणादन्वेषामपीति दीर्घ इति नहिवृत्तिसूत्रे मनोरमायां 1.

P. 63. l. 1. च्छतावृषेति was the reading of C 1. As A 1, however, gave the correct reading च्छतावृषादिति, I naturally accepted it.

P. 63. l. 3. There is no authority for the च of the Berlin MS., not even in Ca.

P. 63. l. 5. The reading of the Berlin MS. निघाताभावात् was well known to me from C 1. I preferred, however, अनिघातात्, because it rests on the authority of A. and B; likewise of Ca.

P. 63. l. 20. सामर्थ्यात् is the reading of all the MSS.; स was a slip of the pen, as well as विलु for विलु on p. 64, l. 5.

P. 65. l. 7. The mistake in the Berlin MS. डोप् संनियोगेन was well known to me from C 1. The reading तत्संनियोगेन has the authority of B. and Ca.

P. 65. l. 9. शब्दे after इचः has the authority of A. and B; C 1. has शब्दो, Ca. has शब्दे.

P. 65. l. 28. The Berlin reading शपा एकादेश उदा° was known to me from C 1. and A. I preferred the reading of B. as clearer in itself, and, at the same time,

as accounting more naturally for the mistake which had happened. In Ca. also, the omission had taken place, but the right reading was restored.

P. 66. l. 21. अश्वसंवंधो has the authority of A. C. B. अश्वबंधो is a mistake; but I should now prefer to write अश्वसंवंधो, which is supported by Ca.

P. 66. l. 24. I changed ह्रीडे to ह्रीठे according to the Bahvr̥cha system of spelling, and retained अझे on the authority of the B. class, which is supported by Ca.

P. 67. l. 25. The reading of the Berlin codex, whether अवण or सवण, is impossible. Between अयण and अयण the choice is sometimes difficult; in our passage, however, the authority of the MSS. is decidedly on the side of अयण.

P. 68. l. 1. पादादित्वेन निघाताभावात् is again supported by B, but अनिघातात् might have been preferable, as it has the support of A. and Ca.

P. 68. l. 14. The reading द्रवतीति वा rests on the authority of the Nirukta, X. 8; and though there are other various readings there, there is none with regard to द्रवतीति. The MSS. of Sāyana are, no doubt, in favour of द्रवत् or द्रवत, but in passages like the one in question, where the copyists hardly understand what they are writing, they are of very small value. I corrected वेधे in the same passage, in Professor Roth's edition, to वेधे, because it is well to distinguish the third from the first person, but I saw no reason for changing यञ्जनां into यञ्जिनां, which has no authority except the Berlin MS. The same applies to क्वेष for क्वैक, p. 68, l. 21; to आरख्यकाडे for आरख्यकाडे, p. 69, l. 6; to ईयत after पुरुष, p. 69, l. 7; and to अदरयिता instead of the only possible form आदरयिता. For यञ्जिनां in the same line there is indeed the authority of C<sub>1</sub>, but the other MSS. have again the reading, which I have given, viz. यञ्जनां.

P. 70. l. 26. सामर्थ्यात् instead of असामर्थ्यात् would be wrong. No MSS. support it, nor do they support वकारः for वादेश, p. 71, l. 2.

P. 71. l. 28. On the possibility of omitting न after इति चेत् see p. x. In our case, as C. and A. give, and B. inserts it, there would have been no excuse for omitting it.

P. 72. l. 1. रेकपद्ये is the right form, and although C. and A. have the र, the B. MSS. have रे, as well as the Berlin MS.

P. 72. l. 8. The mistake समानाधिकरणं instead of समानाधिकरण्यं was known to me from C<sub>1</sub>, but I corrected it on the authority of A. and B, also on account of the words immediately following. The same applies to the omission of चेत् on p. 72, l. 13.

P. 74. l. 5. The reading of the Berlin MS. संगमने for संगमे च would be impossible. It is a quotation from the Dhātu-pāṭha; संगमने would mean the very contrary of संगमे, and no MS. supports it.

Professor Kuhn, in quoting a passage from Sāyana I. 65, 1, श्रूयते च । अग्निर्देवेभ्यो निलायत । अथो रूपं कृत्वा, says (*Zeitschrift*, I. p. 451), "Instead of अथो रूपं कृत्वा we must read either आशं or अथरूपं." I thought so too, but as the MSS. agreed on अथो, and as I could not find the passage, I retained अथो. Even now I have not been able to find the passage, but from such passages as Taitt. Samh. VI. 2, 4, 2, यज्ञो देवेभ्यो निलायत विष्णू रूपं कृत्वा, or Taitt. Brāhm. I. 2, 1, 5, अथो रूपं कृत्वा, I have little doubt that my text is right.

Though the process of examining in detail the value of the various readings culled by Professor Weber from the Berlin MS. was rather tedious, yet I hope it will serve one important purpose. It will show that if we follow carefully the principles of diplomatic criticism, so long recognised by the best classical scholars, it is hardly possible that we should go very far wrong in restoring the text of an ancient author, however illegible or corrupt. The work itself of copying and collating MSS., and eliciting from them the original readings which they presuppose by their agreement as well as by their divergence, requires, no doubt, considerable time and labour; and as I have sometimes been assured that by adopting a less laborious process, I could have finished the edition of Sāyana in a much shorter time, I think it right to show, by a few instances, what the result of this more expeditious proceeding would have been, or, at all events, might have been. Professor Weber, who has on several occasions shown a truly motherly solicitude with regard to my edition of the Rīg-veda, has again and again complained of the delay in the publication of Sāyana. His complaints seem to me, and not to me only, unfounded, his language not quite worthy of him. He has himself edited the Yajur-veda, and he has done so on principles of criticism which he, no doubt, conscientiously prefers, but which I could not bring myself to follow, even if they had enabled him to get through his work much more rapidly. But even this seems to me not quite certain, as the following facts will show.

The first volume of his edition of the Yajur-veda appeared in 1849, the third and last in 1859. One volume only of the three professes to give a complete commentary, the other two contain extracts only, and these so incomplete that Professor Kuhn and others, when they wished to make use



of certain passages in the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa, had to write to India for new extracts. Some scholars think that the time has already come for a new edition of the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa with the *complete* commentary of Sāyaṇa; and if we may accept Professor Weber's candid account of the nature of the extracts from the commentaries on the Sūtras, that work also will sooner or later have to be done again. Far be it from me to say anything unkind of so laborious and so learned a scholar, but as he has so often contrasted his own velocity with my slowness, may I just say in self-defence, that if he will, according to the rules of Adam Riese, to whom he appeals, divide the number of sheets contained in his three volumes, by ten years, and the number of sheets contained in my large and small editions of the Rig-veda by twenty-two years, he will be surprised to find, that the difference between his speed and my slower progress is not so very great after all.

But this, in itself, is of little consequence, nor should I have said one word about it, had I not been so fiercely challenged. The only thing that is of real importance to scholars is, whether it is possible to carry out a critical edition of Sanskrit texts on different principles from those which are followed by Greek and Latin scholars. I say nothing of the texts of the hymns and Brāhmaṇas. They are settled, and require little editing, in the proper sense of the word. With commentaries, however, the case is different, and I still hold that they do require the same amount of critical editing as any classical author.

In order to substantiate this assertion, I shall beg leave to follow Professor Weber's example, and to examine a small portion of his edition of Mahidhara's commentary, by comparing it, not with a MS. which he has *not* collated, but with one which he himself professes to have collated. This is the old MS. belonging to Mill's collection, and marked by Professor Weber as M. The first fifty-two pages of this MS. ought to have been invaluable to any editor. They ought to have been collated with the minutest care, for old MSS. of Mahidhara were then, and are still, scarce. What is Professor Weber's *apparatus criticus*? As far as I can see, he has copied one MS. (A) only, and this is not quite complete; and I believe I am correct in stating, that the only other complete MS. which he possessed for the purpose of his edition, was the copy I had made at Paris of Burnouf's MS., and which I gladly lent to him, and eventually, at his request, presented to the Royal Library at Berlin. This copy, however, can in no sense claim the authority of a MS., because,

though I copied it as well as it was possible in the time given, I never collated it with the original. I therefore, as I said just now, lent my copy to Professor Weber on the distinct understanding that it should never be quoted by him as an authority. Instead of this, it is in most places, if not the only, at least the most important independent authority for the critical restitution of his text. I do not think, that I can be mistaken in this statement. If I am, it is not my fault, for Professor Weber clearly says that he collated the third MS. (O) for the defects of the last twenty-five Adhyâyas only, while the fourth MS. at Paris (P), of which the beginning, from I. 8. to II. 4, was copied by myself, was collated by him no further than the end of the fourth Adhyâya.

There remains, therefore, only the MS., formerly belonging to Dr. Mill, and now in the Bodleian Library, which contains the first twenty Adhyâyas, and has in the beginning those fifty-two old leaves which Professor Weber professes to have collated. By them I shall now try to test the critical state of his edition. I do so simply to test two systems of editorial criticism. Professor Weber knows these various readings, for I showed them to him as soon as his first *fasciculus* had been published. So many years have since elapsed, that I feel I can now speak with perfect freedom, without fearing to give offence by my remarks. The question itself seems to me one, the importance of which cannot be exaggerated. The whole future of Sanskrit scholarship will depend on the decision which our leading Sanskrit scholars shall take between the principles of eclectic and diplomatic criticism. In India the same question is now being agitated, and the scholars of Bombay and Punah, under the auspices of Professors Bühler and Kielhorn, have made their choice. No personal considerations should be mixed up with such a controversy, and the editor of the Yajur-veda will feel, I hope, that, even if judgment should be given against him, which it is not for me to anticipate, he has by his Herculean labours, during the last twenty-five years, raised to himself a pedestal, that would not be shaken by such a decision.

Before I begin my critical examination, I must say a few words on the observance, or rather, non-observance of the rules of Sandhi in Professor Weber's editions. Any one at all familiar with Sanskrit MSS., and particularly with such as are written by scholars, *svârtham*, not *parârtham*, must know, that there is a certain system in the manner in which words are either joined or not joined. Different authors vary, and even the same authors are by no

means consistent in their use of Sandhi, as little as we are in our interpunction. They are guided, in fact, by *vivakshā*, i. e. by what they wish to say. In my edition of Śāyana, I have, as much as possible, followed the Sandhi of the best MSS., and I may at least mention a few cases, which might give rise to misapprehensions. After a vocative, Sandhi is optional; it is mostly omitted, except in cases where the writer perceived a certain continuity between the vocative and what follows immediately after. Between a question and the answer, there is always a break of Sandhi. Verbs of which the one explains the other are without Sandhi, e. g. पितृन् अस्मिन् अवधेयदिति यावत्. But if the verb occurs in the first part of a relative sentence, the Sandhi is generally observed, e. g. ये सुन्विरेऽभिषूयन्तेऽभ्यषूयन्ते ते.

Again, we find frequently in commentaries, where it is desirable to keep the words of the text distinct from the explanations, that Sandhi is avoided. For instance, in relative sentences where, as we saw, the verbs are generally joined, they are still kept asunder, when it can be done, by employing the Virāma. We read, यद्यान् आगच्छन् प्राप्नुवन्. Here the use of the Virāma is very convenient, for it acts as a stop in such cases also where the absence of Sandhi could not otherwise be marked. Frequently we find the Virāma where we should use a small stop, e. g. गिरः स्तोत्रं स्तुतवै, “the voices, the poets, or their songs.” Rv. X. 110, 1, पूजयितः तैः पूज्यमान वा, “thou, the worshipper, or thou worshipped by them.” Rv. X. 113, 10, हे रथकृत् शत्रुभिः सह युद्धकृत् अत एव हे सत्यशुष्म, “O war-maker, maker of fights with enemies, and therefore thou of real strength!” If the Virāma is used, the last letter is not modified. I can hardly remember writers of Sanskrit MSS. putting, e. g. सम्यग् अपि तु, but generally, either सम्यगपि तु, or सम्यक् अपि तु. Nor is it right, I think, to write सम्यक्क्षिपामि, but सम्यक् क्षिपामि, Vâj. Samh. p. 25, l. 19. After a participle, which in itself represents a sentence, the Virāma is very common, e. g. प्रज्ञायुक्तः सन् नोऽस्मभ्यं देहि, “being endowed with wisdom, give to us;” शृण्वन् अकुरुष्वत् etc. In all such cases, I have, as a rule, followed the writing of the best MSS., but I have never allowed a hiatus to remain where it would have destroyed the structure of a sentence. Thus in X. 165, 1, I write कपोतो यद्वाधनमिच्छन् अभिलषन्निदमसदीयं गृहमाजगाम प्राप्नोत् तस्मै etc., “columba quod malum cupiens, desiderans, hanc nostram domum venit, assecuta est, huic malo” etc. Rv. X. 166, 1, न केवलमेकस्या एव गोः पतिं अपि तु सर्वैसामित्याह गवामिति, “wishing to say, not only lord of one cow, but of all cows, he adds gavām.” Rv. X. 191, 3, पूर्वोऽध्वैः परोक्षकृतः उच्चरः प्रत्यक्षकृतः, “the former half-verse is in the third, the latter in the first person.”

In Professor Weber's editions I have in vain looked for any definite system. If he had disregarded the rules of Sandhi altogether, that would have been intelligible. But as he sometimes observes them, and then, without any apparent cause, neglects them, the effect is not only bewildering, but actually misleading. What reason can there be for writing, p. 2, l. 22, अधिकापदौ अग्न्याधानः; p. 4, l. 21, मध्ये एकां; p. 4, l. 25, देवः द्योतमानः तस्मिन्शब्दं; स्वभावतः उरुप्रयाः; मनो आज्यस्य (p. 44, l. 10); and the same in innumerable passages? I hope Professor Weber will not think, that I doubt his knowledge of the rules of Sandhi. What I do not understand is, why he should disregard them in his editions.

I shall not attempt to give all the various readings of Dr. Mill's MS., but only those which serve to determine the relation of this MS. to other MSS., or such as really furnish a correction of a mistake. Professor Weber sometimes gives the various readings of M, sometimes he does not. This again is misleading. If we are told p. ii. l. 9, that B. reads पदाव°, and P. पदावसाना-यावद्रूपं, we conclude that M. agrees with the printed text; but it agrees with B. The various reading, under No. 17, which Professor Weber ascribes to B, belongs to B. and M; No. 18 is supported not only by P, but also by M; No. 33 by B. and M; No. 36 by B. and M. In No. 37, M. has not दधिविशेषस्य, but दधिशेषस्य, and so on.

P. iii. l. 25. शाखामलधूत्याद्यपनयन इदं W. Not only B. has शाखालग्न, as Professor Weber says, but M. also, to say nothing of O. and P. Besides, M. reads शाखालग्नमलधूत्याद्यपनयनं । इदं, which is right.

P. iv. l. 21. व्याकृत W. व्यावृत्त M. (twice), i. e. व्यावृत्त.

P. v. l. 6. हविर्हेतुरुपं W. दधिहेतुरुपं M.

P. v. l. 13. शाश्वतिकीः W. शाश्वतिकाः M.

P. v. l. 21. इषशब्द° W. इषशब्द° M, which is right.

P. v. l. 22. चोदान्नः W. चोदान्नः M, which is right.

P. vi. l. 6. ऊर्जं बलप्राणनयोरस्माद्विष्णु W. M; but read ऊर्जं बलप्राणनयोः । अस्माद्विष्णु ।

P. vi. l. 13. कृवायाजि° W. कृवायाजि° M, which is right.

P. vii. l. 2. हेतुमति च W. हेतुमयि च M, which is right. If the Sûtra had been quoted in full, it would have been necessary to add इति षिञ्.

P. vii. l. 6. पा° ६. १. १९८. This is a false quotation, arising, as I have shown, from a misunderstanding of the whole passage; it ought to be पा° ६. १. १९.

P. viii. l. 3. डेरस्मिन् W. डेः स्मिन् M, which is right, as may be seen from Pân. VII. 1, 15.

P. ix. l. 1. त्वं वायोः W. त्वं मातरिश्चनो वायोः M, which is right.

P. ix. l. 13. तीर्थैमुख्यायां वा after अवागमुख्यायां is not found in B. only, as Professor Weber states, but likewise in M.

P. xi. l. 12. After अग्ने, M. has on the margin अंगतूर्ध्वं यातृग्निः.

P. xi. l. 13. आशीर्लिङ्ग्यासुद् W. आशीर्लिङ् । यासुद् M, which is right.

P. xii. l. 6. वेदेषु W. देवेषु M.

P. xii. l. 11. From वामिति to कर्मणे deest in M.

P. xii. l. 12. युवां कर्मार्थे W. युवां कर्मणे कर्मार्थे M.

P. xii. l. 15. °हवणीव्यापाराः W. °हवणिव्यापाराः M.

P. xii. l. 23. तेऽपि दग्धा अन्यथा न यज्ञसाधनमित्यर्थः. We are told by Professor Weber that अन्यथा is wanting in all the MSS., and so no doubt it is. But why was it put in? The sense is clear: "The enemies are burnt, not the vessel, i.e. the instrument with which the sacrifice is accomplished." Did Professor Weber think it meant, "The enemies also are burnt, otherwise there is no accomplishing the sacrifice?" But this would have been यज्ञसिद्धिः. Uvaṭa makes it still clearer: सुतरां तत्रं रक्षः । न तु यज्ञसाधनमित्यभिप्रायः\*.

P. xiii. l. 2. पार्श्वयोरेव स्थितं W. पार्श्वयोरवस्थितं M.

P. xiii. l. 5. तिष्ठन्त्समंङ्गि W. तिष्ठत्समंङ्गि M, which is right, as अन् is neuter.

P. xiii. l. 14. हिंसितुमुद्यताः W. हिंसितुमुद्युक्ताः M.

P. xiv. l. 6. धारकं पोषकं भवसि W. धारकं पोषकं वासि M.

P. xiv. l. 11. शकटस्य व्रीहीणां W. शकटस्यव्रीहीणां M, which is right.

P. xv. l. 4. काभ्यामश्विनोर्बौहुभ्यां W. काभ्यां । अश्विनोर्बौहुभ्यां M, which is right, for there must be a stop at the end of a question, and the answer begins with अश्विनोः.

P. xv. l. 21. त्वा संपरिश्लेषयामि । W. त्वा त्वां परिश्लेषयामि, which seems better; the same on p. xxxiii. l. 12, and elsewhere.

P. xvi. l. 19. After गुप्मानुत्पुनामि, M. adds उत्कर्षेण श्लेषयामि, which is left out by Professor Weber, as well as च on the next line after सूयैस्य.

P. xvii. l. 16. The Vārttika is not Pāṇ. VI. 4, 68, 1, but VI. 4, 77, 1. The वा ought not to be without Sandhi, otherwise it would be taken for वै.

P. xviii. l. 4. After कृष्णाजिनोलूखलादीनि, M. has पात्राणि, which is left out by Professor Weber.

P. xviii. l. 17. पतितम् एवमरातयोऽपि पातितः W. M. has पातितं, which is right, as may

\* अन्यथा, which is here inserted, was omitted by Professor Weber in another passage, viz. Vāj. Prātisākhya I. 90. (Indische Studien IV. 127.) We ought to read अन्यथा, instead of यथा.

be seen by the preceding instrumental कृष्णाजिनकंपनेन, and by the immediately following पातितः.

P. xix. l. 8. यतस्त्वत्तक्षिभं W. यतस्तत् तक्षिभं M, which is right.

P. xx. l. 6. मधुजिह्वकश्चासि W. मधुजिह्वश्चासि M.

P. xx. l. 21. तद्गतजलेन W. तद्गतजलेन M, which is better.

P. xxi. l. 9. प्राशितप्रहारेण W. प्राशितप्रहारेण, not only B. P, but also M.

P. xxii. l. 22. अंगुलिदानासक्तं मा दृहेत्यर्थः W. अंगुलिदानासक्तं मा दहेत्यर्थः M, which is right.

P. xxiv. l. 1. तदुत्पन्ना त्वं W. तदुत्पन्नत्वात् M, which seems better.

P. xxiv. l. 8. हे उपले उपरितनशिल त्वं W. हे उपले उपरितनशिले त्वं M, which is right.

P. xxiv. l. 10. बालस्वरूपा W. बालास्वरूपा M, which is better.

P. xxv. l. 21. पिष्टसंयवनीया W. पिष्टसंयवनीया, not only B, but also M. On संयवनं see p. 26, l. 9.

P. xxix. l. 10. किं च अस्माद्° W. किंच अतोऽस्माद्°, which is right.

P. xxx. l. 8. निष्काशितः W. निष्कासितः M, which is better, see Boehtlingk's Dictionary, s. v. l. 24. निः काशनेन W. निष्कासनेन M.

P. xxx. l. 13. पूर्वस्यामाहवनीयः पालकोऽस्तीति भावः । W. पूर्वस्यामाहवनीय एव पालकोऽस्तीति भावः M.

P. xxxi. l. 14. विविधं रपति वेदत्रयरूपेण शब्दं करोतीति विरप्शी । यज्ञो वेदित्वं प्राप्तो विष्णुः संबोध्यते W. Here, first of all, यज्ञे is not supported by B. P. only, as Professor Weber states, but also by M. Secondly, the passage, as printed, does not construe properly, for वेदत्रयरूपेण शब्दं करोति requires the complement of either यज्ञः or विष्णुः. We might read इति विरप्शी यज्ञः, or continue इति विरप्शी यज्ञे वेदित्वं प्राप्तो विष्णुः. The latter seems Mahīdhara's intention, for Uvaṭa, from whom he quotes, writes, विरप्शन्निति । आर्षमन्त्रितं । महत्तमम् । स च विष्णुर्यज्ञे वेदित्वमापन्नः । स हि त्विभिर्वेदैर्निर्वैर्त्यनानो विविधं रपति शब्दं करोति ।

P. xxxi. l. 18. पंचम्यर्थौ षष्ठौ W. पंचम्यर्थे षष्ठौ M, which, considering the gender of षष्ठौ, is right.

P. xxxi. l. 19. दातृं W. दातृं M, which, considering what goes before, seems better.

P. xxxvi. l. 18. बर्हिर्बुधं W. बर्हिषे बुधं M, which is right.

P. xxxvii. l. 2. ज्ञेदनमसि W. ज्ञेदनसाधनमसि M, which is better.

P. xxxvii. l. 16. कथा W. श्रुतिकथा, not only B. P, but also M, which omits कृत before इति.

P. xxxviii. l. 21. After इतिर्गतिः, M. adds विविधेतिर्वीतिः, which is omitted by Professor Weber.

P. xxxix. l. 14. अभिविदधाति W. अभिनिदधाति M, which is right.

P. xl. l. 19. परिक्राममिति W. परिक्रामन्निति, not only B, but also M.

P. xliii. l. 16. M. reads द्वितीयं प्राप्नोति । उपहृतो द्यौः पिता । एवं द्यौः पिता जगत्पालक उपहृत इत्यादि समानार्थः, which seems better.

P. xliv. l. 7. मां ब्रह्माणमव पालय W. मानध्वंमव । पालय M. Uvaṭa has only मामव । पालय.

P. xliv. l. 23. अतः प्राकृतमार्गे W. अतः परं, not only B, but also M. Uvaṭa says, एषा ते अग्ने । इतः प्रभृति प्राकृतमार्गे.

P. xlv. l. 3. आसिधीमहि च W. आ आसिधीमहि च M, which is right.

P. xlvii. l. 2. पृथिवीसंबंधिभागानादाय W. पृथिवीसंबंधिभोगानादाय M, which is right. Uvaṭa also has पृथिवीसंबंधिभिर्भोगैः.

P. xlvii. l. 20. M. has neither तांतं nor नांतं, the reading assigned to all the MSS. by Professor Weber, but simply त.

P. xlviii. l. 11. विश्वे देवा W. विश्वे सर्वे देवा M.

P. l. l. 14. Here M. has really an independent reading, which, whether right or wrong, ought not to have been passed over. We read, हे गातुविदो यज्ञवेत्तारो देवा गातुमित्रा । इण गत्यर्थः । गत्यर्थस्ते ज्ञानार्थः । अस्मदीयो यज्ञः प्रवृत्त इति ज्ञाना गातुमित । यज्ञं प्रत्यागच्छत ॥

P. li. l. 22. M. also, like the other MSS., has संबंधः, and there was no necessity for changing it, as Professor Weber does, to संबद्धः, if we only read with M. समित्युपसर्गाणामगन्तहीत्यनेन संबंधः प्रत्येकं ।

P. lii. l. 1. वर्चसाद्यपैति W. वर्चसाद्यपैति M, which is right. Uvaṭa says, यज्ञमुपगच्छतः पुरुषस्य सर्वमेवैतदपैति वर्चसादि । अतोऽनेन पुनराप्यायति ।

These are various readings\* selected from fifty-two pages, and they must for the present suffice to show, how much might have been gained by a real collation of this valuable fragment, and by a genealogical classification of the other MSS. It is not for me to exaggerate the importance of these

\* I add a few more in a note: On page 56, line 2, M. repeats चतुर्वचः; l. 3, it adds संबन्धिने after युष्माकं; l. 5, it reads व्याख्याताः; l. 9, it adds क्रुद्ध after शिशिरस्तु; l. 18, it adds गायत्री पितृदेवता after पुत्रकामेति; the u from सुक्, i.e. सक्, l. 21, should go to कामार, l. 16. P. 59, l. 21, येतेभ्यः. P. 60, l. 8, पूर्णोदति; l. 11, तस्य तनवा°; l. 13, घृतं; l. 16, जातवेदसे after ज्वलिताय; ibid. वेदयतीति; l. 20, यविष्य. P. 61, l. 18, हिरण्यमुषा°; l. 20, M. adds after आदध्यात्, इदं गार्हपत्याधानं । तस्मात्प्राच्यामष्टप्रक्रमेषु तथैव संभारेषु भुञ्जैवः सुविरिति पंचाक्षरासु-चरत्वादध्यात् । The same accident, from a mere *homoio-*

M. reads आश्रयभूता एवमहं महत्त्वेन सर्वप्राणिनामाश्रय-भूतो भूयासं; l. 21, अग्निमपि तामिरेवाद°. P. 63, l. 2, प्राप्तवान्; l. 12, अग्निरेव. P. 64, l. 3, भागं; l. 7, सापि पत°. P. 65, l. 14, अग्निं वावादिताः. P. 67, l. 7, महान् । जग°. P. 68, l. 11, धातुभिरधापि, and hence, l. 12, बहुलं etc. left out. P. 70, l. 16, विद्यमानान्. P. 71, l. 5, प्रायैना. P. 74, l. 18, पुत्रपौत्रादि; l. 24, यदा यदा वयं जुहुमस्तदा तदा. P. 75, l. 15, again a *homoio-teleuton* has caused the following omission after हेर्धिः, छांदसौ गुणधलोपौ । श्रुधि । श्रुशृणुपृक्कृभ्यश्छंदसोति हेर्धिः. P. 77, l. 9, प्रकर्षेण मा, etc.

various readings, but what I think cannot be exaggerated is the importance of a truly scholarlike spirit in editing our Sanskrit texts; in fact, in doing everything we have to do in life. I know there are Sanskrit scholars whose labours I highly appreciate, who totally differ from me on this point. They look upon this kind of minute scholarship as mere waste of time, and as pedantry inherited from classical philology. Let them but read the history of classical philology and the history of the editions of Greek and Latin authors, and they will find, that the neglect of these *minutiae* has always proved most fatal, and that what one generation considered as *minima*, the next recognised as *maxima*. Anyhow, even if I should be mistaken in these opinions, I hope I shall be absolved from any blame if, by trying to apply to Sanskrit the same critical method which I had been taught by Hermann and Haupt for Greek and Latin, I have edited every year a hundred pages less than I might otherwise have done.

I also trust that in thus endeavouring to vindicate the critical principles which I have followed, by contrasting them with those of Professor Weber, I shall not appear to have unfairly depreciated the labours of one of my most esteemed fellow-students. He has, no doubt, by this time discovered many, possibly all, of these mistakes himself, and he has altogether done so much useful work that no one would wish to be hard on him on account of these little accidents. With scholars, and with all true men of science, who care for truth, the question, as I said in another place, is never, who is right and who is wrong, but what is right and what is wrong. The life of a scholar would not be worth living, if, in return for many things which he has to surrender, he did not secure for himself that one inestimable privilege of owing allegiance to no person, to no party, to no school or *clique*, but being able at all times to speak the truth, and nothing but the truth, about all things which concern him, convinced that all who deserve the name of scholars will thank him where he has pointed out any of their mistakes, will forgive him even where he may have spoken rather freely or bluntly, and will defend him against the clamour of those who seem to think they are nothing, unless they are infallible.

I may take this opportunity of replying to some of my own critics. In the Preface to my reprint of the Rig-veda, I had stated that although in order to have the Samhitâ and Pada-texts corresponding to each other, page by page, the words in the Samhitâ-text had to be spaced very considerably, yet, even thus, and printed in the largest Devanâgarî types, that



text occupied a smaller number of pages than the edition printed with Roman letters. I went on to say, "No one who knows the peculiarity of the Sanskrit alphabet, would suppose that a Roman transcript could ever occupy less space than the original Devanâgarî. We have here used the largest Devanâgarî types, we have lost much space in having to print the accents above and below the letters, and had thus only twenty-four lines on each page against twenty-seven lines in the Romanised text (*exclusive of notes*), and yet the sum total of our pages is only 844, against 920 pages required for the transcript in Roman letters."

The facts themselves are patent, and known to every beginner in Sanskrit. It is true that our ordinary founts of Devanâgarî are very large, and that the complicated character of certain Sanskrit letters will render it difficult ever to match the smallest Roman types. But what can be clearer than the fount of the Royal Printing Office at Berlin, used, for instance, in Professor Kielhorn's edition of the *Phit-sûtras*? Yet, even smaller types than those would still be perfectly legible. The advantages inherent in the Devanâgarî alphabet, as such, and quite independent of the different sizes of different founts, are these. According to the peculiar nature of the Sanskrit alphabet, we save nearly all *a's*, *e's*, *u's*, *ri's*, and they are many; we save final and medial *m's*, and they are many too; and we are able to combine sundry consonants so as to form more compact groups. Hence the saving of space. But as this has been denied, I must now try to give geometrical demonstration.

In the three columns on the opposite page, the first contains the largest Devanâgarî types, with accents, these accents necessitating larger spaces between the lines, which would be saved in printing ordinary Sanskrit.

The second column contains the smaller Devanâgarî types, again with accents. These types are cast on the same body, as printers call it, as the Roman types used in the third column, and we have therefore between the second and third columns common ground on which to institute a real and rational comparison. The system of transcription is that adopted by Professor Aufrecht in his excellent edition of the hymns in Roman letters. The spaces, however, between the words have been reduced, and another saving has been effected by removing the unnecessary, and rather objectionable, break at the end of each Varga; otherwise no alterations have been made, excepting the change of *n* into *ñ* in *yajña*, and the addition of a *c* in *gacchati*.

अग्निमीळे पुरोहितं य-  
ज्ञस्य देवमृत्विजं । होतारं र-  
त्नधातमं ॥१॥ अग्निः पूर्वे-  
भिर्ऋषिभिरीड्यो नूतनैरु-  
त । स देवाँ एह वक्षति ॥२॥  
अग्निना रयिमन्ववत्पोषमे-  
व दिवेदिवे । यज्ञसं वीरवत्त-  
मं ॥३॥ अग्ने यं यज्ञमध्वरं वि-  
श्वतः परिभूरसि । स इहेवेषु  
गच्छति ॥४॥ अग्निर्होता क-  
विर्ऋतुः सत्यश्चित्रवस्तमः ।  
देवो देवेभिरा गमत् ॥५॥ य-  
दंग दाशुषे त्वमग्ने भद्रं करि-  
ष्यसि । तवैतत्सत्यमंगिरः ॥६॥  
उप त्वाग्ने दिवेदिवे दोषाव-  
स्तर्धिया वयं । नमो भरत ए-  
मसि ॥७॥ राजतमध्वराणां  
गोपामृतस्य दीदिवि । वर्ध-  
मानं स्वे दमे ॥८॥ स नः पि-  
तेव सूनवेऽग्ने सूपायनो भ-  
व । स च स्वा नः स्वस्तये ॥९॥

अग्निमीळे पुरोहितं यज्ञस्य देवमृत्वि-  
जं । होतारं रत्नधातमं ॥१॥ अग्निः पूर्वे-  
भिर्ऋषिभिरीड्यो नूतनैरुत । स देवाँ एह  
वक्षति ॥२॥ अग्निना रयिमन्ववत्पोषमेव  
दिवेदिवे । यज्ञसं वीरवत्तमं ॥३॥ अग्ने यं  
यज्ञमध्वरं विश्वतः परिभूरसि । स इहेवेषु  
गच्छति ॥४॥ अग्निर्होता कविर्ऋतुः सत्य-  
श्चित्रवस्तमः । देवो देवेभिरा गमत् ॥५॥ य-  
दंग दाशुषे त्वमग्ने भद्रं करिष्यसि । तवे-  
तत्सत्यमंगिरः ॥६॥ उप त्वाग्ने दिवेदिवे  
दोषावस्तर्धिया वयं । नमो भरत एमसि ॥७॥  
राजतमध्वराणां गोपामृतस्य दीदिवि । व-  
र्धमानं स्वे दमे ॥८॥ स नः पितेव सूनवेऽग्ने  
सूपायनो भव । स च स्वा नः स्वस्तये ॥९॥

Agnīm ile puróhitam  
yajñásya devám řitvījam ।  
hótāraṁ ratnadhātamam  
॥ 1 ॥ agnīḥ pā́rvebhir řishi-  
bhir īdyo nūtanair utá ।  
sá devāñ éhá vakshati  
॥ 2 ॥ agnínâ rayím aṇa-  
vat pósham evá divé-  
dive । yaçásam virávatta-  
mam ॥ 3 ॥ ágne yám yaj-  
ñám adhvarām viçvátaḥ  
paribhūr ási । sá íd de-  
véshu gacchati ॥ 4 ॥ agnīr  
hótâ kavíratuḥ satyaç ci-  
trâçravastamaḥ । devó de-  
vébhir ā gamat ॥ 5 ॥ yád  
aṅgá dâçúshe tvám ágne  
bhadráṁ karishyási । tá-  
vét tát satyám āngiraḥ  
॥ 6 ॥ úpa tvāgne divé-dive  
dóshâvastar dhiyā va-  
yám । námo bháranta éma-  
si ॥ 7 ॥ rājantam adhvarā-  
ṇām gopām řitásya dīdi-  
vim । vārdhamānaṁ své  
dāme ॥ 8 ॥ sá naḥ pité-  
va sūnávé 'gne sūpāyanó  
bhava । sácasvâ naḥ sva-  
stāye ॥ 9 ॥

Each column measures exactly 1 inch and  $\frac{1}{16}$  of an inch in width. The small Sanskrit type occupies 3 inches and  $\frac{1}{16}$  of an inch in length; the largest Sanskrit type 5 inches and  $\frac{1}{16}$  of an inch; the Roman type, without reckoning the last line, 6 inches and  $\frac{1}{16}$  of an inch. No doubt, if we compare a Sanskrit text, printed in large Devanāgarī types, with another, printed in small Roman type, the advantage, inherent in the Devanāgarī alphabet, is somewhat reduced. But if we want to find out the relative merits of two

alphabets, we must surely give the same start to both, or inform the judges that it is a handicap race.

What follows, is still more curious. In comparing the two texts, the one in Devanâgarî, the other in Roman types, I have been accused of having suppressed the fact, that in the latter edition, there are about four lines of notes on each page, reducing the number of lines from thirty-one to twenty-seven. This, however, is the very fact which I make a point of stating, saying, "Thus we had only twenty-four lines on each page against twenty-seven lines in the Romanised text, *exclusive of notes!*" These were, in fact, the very four lines which I wanted for my own argument, as a make-weight against the exceptional spacing of the Samhitâ-text and the accents below the line; my object being to show, that what in our case was exceptional on one side, viz. the wide spacing and the accents below the line, was matched by what was exceptional on the other side, viz. the four lines of notes at the bottom.

Let me add one word more to my critics in general. No one, I can honestly assure them, is more truly grateful than I am to those who have really taken the trouble of pointing out mistakes which I have committed; no one, as I think I have shown sufficiently, is more indifferent to any hard words by which it is thought that such criticisms can be rendered more emphatic. During the whole of my literary career I have always availed myself of whatever was really good in the remarks of my critics, and have given them the fullest credit for it. But I have not been able to bring myself to waste my time in idle wrangling. If in matters of opinion I find that another scholar differs honestly from my own views, I am not so diffident as to fear that everybody will think me wrong, and him right; nor so conceited as to imagine that, even if my own views are right, I could always convince him that they are so. I have spoken, and he has spoken, and, as in Parliament, I do not claim the right of reply, except when matters of fact have been misstated. We both stand before our judges, and trusting in the indestructible strength of truth, I have never declined to submit to their verdict. I know I have sometimes been blamed for not replying to my critics, but such blame was most unjust. The fact is, that I could not possibly do it. When books are reviewed, as they now are, not only in England, but in almost every country of Europe, nay, even in America and India, what are we to do? Many of these reviews never reached me at all, but even if I had attempted

to read and notice those only which I happened to see, I should have had no time left for anything else. It was not want of respect that made me silent, but simply want of time\*. No author, when he publishes books, containing new facts and new theories, expects that the whole world will at once say, Amen. If it were so, the book would probably never have been written. An author must be prepared for contradiction and censure, and we all know that from certain quarters censure is more flattering than praise. After a time, every author becomes a target, but fortunately, not every shot that is fired, however loud the report, hits the mark. As far as my own experience goes, I have felt much more frequently inclined to protest against unmerited praise, than against unmerited blame. There are few things written by any scholar of my name, for which, at some time or other, I have not received the credit, though I did all I could to disclaim those equivocal honours. There are few languages which I am not supposed to know, though again and again I have protested against the laurels of a Mezzofanti.

These are old perplexities of which those who came before us have complained, and of which those who follow after, will complain likewise. Let me conclude with the verses of an old Indian poet:

What care we for the praise of him who lauds  
In ignorance of where our merit lies?  
What painter values at a rush applause,  
However loud, from him that lacketh eyes?

\* I venture to avail myself of this opportunity to explain another apparent neglect on my part, for which, I know, I have been blamed, if not in public, at least in private. During the last ten years the number of books sent me from all parts of the world has become so great that I had to give up the attempt to acknowledge them all. When I was a young man, it was generally understood, that no acknowledgment was expected, when a book was sent without a letter. To that rule I have conformed, both as a sender and as a receiver of presentation copies. There are, of course, exceptions, but they should be treated as such. It should also be publicly stated, that books sent through friends or booksellers, are apt to miscarry. A friend of mine bought a volume of the Rig-veda at a sale in Paris, and when he opened it, he found, that it was the very copy which I had sent him years ago as a present. How such accidents can be avoided,

I cannot tell. It is generally said, that Humboldt acknowledged all books, and answered all letters. That may be so, but not every man is a Humboldt, and Humboldt died before the penny post attained its full development. When I tell my friends that, though most letters are now penny letters, I spent in one year £18 for postage, they can easily find out the number of letters I have to write, and I feel sure they will forgive me, if I do not always write by return of post, that "I am looking forward with the greatest pleasure to reading their books." Nothing gives me greater pleasure than reading books written by men with whom I am personally acquainted. But if a friend sends me a book on Comparative Mythology, while I am in the midst of work on Sanskrit accentuation, I must put his work aside for a time, and cannot express an opinion till I find leisure to read it carefully. *Soyons raisonnables !*

Nay, blame itself we'd rather choose to hear,  
 If that the judge discerns the fault he shows;  
 And censure pleases the judicious more  
 Than floods of flattery from fools like those.

I have still the pleasant duty to fulfil of thanking my many friends, both old and young, for the constant help which they have given me during the many years that I have been engaged in this edition of the Rig-veda. Some of them are no more amongst us, but the names of Burnouf, Bunsen, Wilson, Mill, Trithen, Roër, Bardelli, Goldstücker, Ballantyne, Bhao Daji, and I must also add the names of two most excellent printers, Pembrey, whose son keeps up the reputation of his father, and Hickman, a truly noble soul, will always be remembered with gratitude by one to whom, each in his own way, they have shown so much kindness, and rendered such essential help. To those who are still living, and who have assisted me by their advice and by their active co-operation, particularly to Professor Theodore Aufrecht, Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall, Professor Haug, I have in the Preface to each successive volume expressed my deep obligation. With regard to the last volume, I have to add the names of Professors Cowell, Eggeling, Thibaut, and Mr. Burnell. My old friend Professor Cowell, though fully occupied with other work, has never grudged me his time, whether for reading proof-sheets, or for giving me his opinion on difficult passages. Professor Eggeling has rendered me most useful service in the same manner; and to Professor Thibaut I am especially indebted for the assistance he has rendered me in reading revises and in preparing the Index of the Uttarapadas. That Index is founded on the *Index verborum*, printed in the fifth and sixth volumes. It is arranged alphabetically; first, according to the Uttarapada; then, according to the Pûrvapada. It will be seen that it contains all the words, actually divided by an Avagraha, except those in which the second part was a mere suffix, रसवान्, यज्ञःनरः, or a termination, अग्निःभिः. It also contains other words which, though, according to the system of the Prâtiśâkhyas, they could not have the Avagraha, could easily be divided, and were thought to be useful to the students of the Veda. The principle followed in the selection was that of practical usefulness, not of systematic completeness. If, as happens frequently, the same Uttarapada occurs with different accents, then it is first placed as âdyudâtta, afterwards as madhyodâtta, as antodâtta, and lastly as anudâtta.

Mr. Burnell's readiness in helping me to obtain information on some MSS. in India, has been acknowledged; and I still hope, that his researches may produce new and important results.

In preparing the Indices of the Devatâs, the Ṛishis, and the Pratikas, I have been able to avail myself of the labours of Professors Roth, Whitney, Aufrecht, and others. The last index, that of the beginnings of the verses of the Rig-veda, was prepared by them, and finished by Dr. Pertsch (*Indische Studien*, vol. III). Though these names were a sufficient warrant for completeness and accuracy, I have been able, while using the index during the last twenty years, to make many corrections and additions, and I have also to thank Dr. Pertsch for a list of *Corrigenda*, which he kindly sent me. In printing this and the other indices of the Devatâs and Ṛishis, I have, for the sake of expediting the printing, used the smallest possible number of diacritical letters. The indices are meant for scholars only; and scholars, when they read samhitâ, tam hi, anga, panca, yajna, kâṇḍa, know that they are meant for samhitâ, tam hi, aṅga, pañca, yajña, kâṇḍa. In the Prefaces, however, and in the *Varietas Lectionis*, I have throughout followed the transcription which Professor Wilson wished me to adopt when I began this work, and which, though it differs from my own system of italic letters, will be found to answer exactly the same purpose.

F. MAX MÜLLER.

OXFORD, 14 SEPTEMBER, 1874,

*The first day of the International Congress of Orientalists  
in London.*

P. 36. l. 3. (IV. 4, 5.) जामि जामिं वंधुं अबंधुशतून् A. जामिजामिं वंधुशतून् C. जामिं वंधुमजामिमबंधुं यतादृशान् शतून् B.

P. 38. l. 12. (IV. 4, 9.) परिचरति A. B. परिचरयेव स्तोता C.

P. 41. l. 8. (IV. 4, 14.) वा before वाजान् inserted by conjecture.

P. 41. l. 11. (IV. 4, 14.) प्रतिपादितं A. B. प्रार्थितं C.

P. 41. l. 21. (IV. 4, 15.) After परिचरेम ।, Ca. has भूते वा लिङ् । पर्यचराम ।.

P. 42. l. 23. (IV. 5, 1.) सामर्थ्याद्विवरिति C. सामर्थ्याद्विधिरिति A. B.

P. 43. l. 9. (IV. 5, 1.) किमिव—कूलमिव in A. B. C.; it seems to be a marginal note.

P. 43. l. 17. (IV. 15, 3.) प्रकारं C. प्रकारतरां A. B.

P. 43. l. 19. (IV. 15, 3.) नीयमानः C. स्थापितः B.; omitted in A.

P. 44. l. 15. (IV. 5, 4.) ये द्वेष्टाः conjecture. A. C. have द्वेष्टाः after स्थिराणि. B. omits it, but gives द्वेष्टून् after जानतः.

P. 45. l. 24. (IV. 5, 7.) समानं सर्वेषामेकरूपं ॥ सर्वेषामेकरूपं समानं A. B. C.

P. 46. l. 5. (IV. 5, 7.) लुप्तोपममेतत् ॥ लुप्तोपमैतत् A. B. C.

P. 46. l. 7. (IV. 5, 7.) ज्योतिरादिभि C. ज्योतिरादित्वा A. B.

P. 46. l. 9. (IV. 5, 7.) आरूपितं देवैर्नमस्या A. आरूपितं आरोपितं देवैर्नमस्यं B. आरूपितं आरोपितं देवैरप्या C.

P. 48. l. 12. (IV. 5, 12.) दातव्यं C. तद्दातव्यं A. B.

P. 49. l. 1. (IV. 5, 13.) After पालयिष्यः, Ca. पत्नीस्थानीया वा ।.

P. 49. l. 9. (IV. 5, 14.) उक्थेन A. B. C. उद्धेन Ca.

P. 50. l. 9. (IV. 6, 1.) इत्यत्र प्रकृत्यंशोनुवादः कः Ca. इत्यत्र कृत्यंशोनुवाकः A. B. C.

P. 56. l. 11. (IV. 7, 3.) प्रभासकं वृद्धेः कर्तारं C. प्रारंभकं B. A. gives no explanation.

P. 58. l. 4. (IV. 7, 7.) स्थाने after धामनि inserted from C.

P. 59. l. 9. (IV. 7, 9.) यद्यं त्वां B. C. यद्यद्वा A.

P. 59. l. 10. (IV. 7, 9.) जननहेतुं ॥ जनकहेतुं A. C. हेतुकहेतुं B.

P. 63. l. 24. (IV. 9, 5.) ब्रह्मा वो ॥ ब्रह्मा त्वो A. B. ब्रह्मा यो C.

P. 63. l. 25. (IV. 9, 5.) वा before सदस्यो added from C.

P. 68. l. 10. (IV. 11, 1.) भद्रं भजनीयं C.; omitted in A. भद्रं मंगलं B.: cf. 10, 1.

P. 71. l. 9. (IV. 12, 1.) छंदः supplied. त्रैष्टुभं C. त्रैष्टुभो A. B.

P. 71. l. 18. (IV. 12, 1.) भावत्केन Ca. लोषकेण A. तोषकेण B. C.

P. 72. l. 4. (IV. 12, 2.) यो after परिचरन् by conjecture. C. has स.

P. 74. l. 18. (IV. 13, 2.) मित्रोऽहर्भिमानी added from C. B. has only मित्रो.

P. 75. l. 2. (IV. 13, 3.) अविमुंचतः B. C. अविंसंयतः A.; probably meant for अविंसंयतः.

P. 75. l. 10. (IV. 13, 4.) जगन्निर्वाहात्मकस्य रसस्यादानार्थं ॥ जगन्निर्वाहात्मकस्यादानार्थं A. C. जगन्निर्वाहात्मकस्य दानार्थं B. जगन्निर्वाहात्मकस्य रसस्यादानार्थं Ca.

P. 75. l. 12. (IV. 13, 4.) संवृषवन् C. अवृषवन् A. B.

P. 76. l. 2. (IV. 13, 5.) नाकेन समवेतः A. C. च्युतेन समवेतः B.

P. 78. l. 3. (IV. 15, 1.) अस्य after पराभ्यां A. B. C.

P. 78. l. 25. (IV. 15, 2.) पर्येति A. B. C. परियाति Ait. Br.

- P. 79. l. 13. (IV. 15, 4.) सात्यहव्यो ॥ सत्येहव्यो C. स्यात्यहव्यो Ca. स्यत्यहव्यो B. श्रत्यहव्यो A.  
P. 79. l. 14. (IV. 15, 4.) अयीयजदिति ॥ यीयज इति C. यीयजत इति A. यीयजो यज्ञे इति B.  
P. 79. l. 22. (IV. 15, 5.) एतेन यजमानस्य A. B. अनेन यजमानः C.  
P. 82. l. 1. 3. (IV. 16, 2.) समीपे नाश्वान्मनुष्या यथा मुञ्चति ॥ समीपे पश्चान्न मनुष्या यथा मुञ्चति A.  
समीपे अश्वान्न मनुष्या यथा अश्वान्मुञ्चति C. समीचेन मनुष्या यथा आश्वान्मुञ्चति B.  
P. 83. l. 24. (IV. 16, 6.) पर्वतमपि मेघं वा । अश्मेति मेघनामैतत् ॥ पर्वतमिति मेघं वा । मेघनामैतत् A. C.  
पर्वतं मेघं पर्वतमितिः मेघनामैतत् B. पर्वतमपि मेघं वा Ca.  
P. 84. l. 10. (IV. 16, 7.) वभूष ॥ वभूष A. B. उभूः C.  
P. 85. l. 1. 1. (IV. 16, 9.) इति नृमणः A. C. इति नृमणः B. It ought to be नृमणाः ।  
P. 89. l. 1. 3. (IV. 16, 17.) अयोधि A. B. C.  
P. 91. l. 2. (IV. 17, 1.) त्वं महौ इति added by conjecture. The second Viniyoga is only given by C.  
P. 92. l. 18. (IV. 17, 4.) विनाशरहितं Ca. विचाररहितं A. C. विच्युतिरहितं B.  
P. 98. l. 2. (IV. 17, 16.) From एवंभूतं to इत्यर्थः only in C. B. has कोशमाधारभूतमिन्द्रमवते  
रक्षणाथै नाच्यावियामः न त्वजामः भजेम इत्यर्थः.  
P. 101. l. 24. (IV. 18, 3.) अन्वव्रीत् ॥ अनुव्रीत् B. अनुव्रीत् A. C.  
P. 103. l. 10. (IV. 18, 6.) प्रतिपादकोद्धृतेन A. B. C.  
P. 103. l. 24. (IV. 18, 7.) पापं after ब्रह्महत्यारूपं supplied by conjecture.  
P. 108. l. 5. (IV. 19, 2.) नदीः C. आपः तासां B.; omitted in A.  
P. 112. l. 21. (IV. 20, 2.) अभिलक्षीकृत्य C. अभिलक्ष्य B. अभिमुखीकृत्य A.  
P. 113. l. 25. (IV. 20, 5.) इव after वीरपुरुष added from B. यो by conjecture.  
P. 114. l. 12. (IV. 20, 6.) नृष्टं निर्गतं A. B. C. नृष्टं निर्गतं Ca. The usual explanation would be नितरां प्राप्तं or व्याप्तं ।  
P. 114. l. 19. (IV. 20, 7.) वारयिता A. B. निवारयिता C.  
P. 119. l. 10. (IV. 21, 7.) सेवत इति यत् तत् B. C. सेवत इति यावत् A.  
P. 121. l. 15. (IV. 22, 1.) यद्धिरादिकं च ॥ यत्त हविरादिकं च A. B. यच्च हविरादिकं च C.  
P. 125. l. 10. (IV. 22, 10.) उपमाहि देहि C. उपमाहि उपसंस्त्रि A. B.  
P. 126. l. 8. (IV. 23, 1.) कस्य after होमनिष्पादकस्य added by conjecture.  
P. 131. l. 2. (IV. 24, 1.) परमैश्वर्ययुक्तं ॥ परमैश्वर्यं A. B. C.  
P. 132. l. 10. (IV. 24, 4.) तदानीमेव नेमे केचन भाग्यवंतो C. तदानीमेवा तमे वा तमे क तं भाग्यवंतो A.  
तदानीमेव नेमे भाग्यवंतो B.  
P. 133. l. 3. (IV. 24, 6.) Ca. has after इत्या, सत्यमेव.  
P. 133. l. 5. (IV. 24, 6.) The Pada MSS. have in the text अविवेनन्. The Sanhitā MSS. S. 2. 3. have अविवेनं तमिन्; S. 1. अविवेनन्तमिन्. Sāyana read अविवेनं.  
P. 133. l. 16. (IV. 24, 7.) अन्नवाची A. अन्न भृष्टयवाची C. The whole passage is left out in B.  
P. 134. l. 10. (IV. 24, 9.) न विक्रीतस्त्वयं मया C. न स विक्रीतवान्पुरा A. B. न विक्रीतः स्वयं मया Ca.  
P. 134. l. 12. (IV. 24, 9.) वक्षं B. वक्षुं A. क्रेतुः C.  
P. 134. l. 13. (IV. 24, 9.) चेकृतो ॥ चेकृतो C. चेकृतो A. Ca. चेकृतो B. Aa.



- P. 134. l. 13. (IV. 24, 9.) अथ मृत्यार्थमेतस्यामविचार्यैव निरर्थः A. अथ मृत्यार्थमेतस्यामविचार्यैव निश्चयः B. अथ मृत्यार्थमेतस्यात् विचार्यैव तु निरर्थः Ca. °मेतस्यात् C.
- P. 134. l. 14. (IV. 24, 9.) इत्येवं C. अन्येव A. अन्येन B.
- P. 134. l. 17. (IV. 24, 9.) इत्ययं A. C. ईरितं B.
- P. 135. l. 2. (IV. 24, 10.) स्तुतिभिः। deest in A. B.
- P. 135. l. 24. (IV. 25, 1.) तर्पणाय ईद्रे । ईद्रे स्तौति C. अपर्णाय ईद्रे । स ईद्रेः A. अपर्णाय ईद्रे । याचते स ईद्रेः B.
- P. 137. l. 1. (IV. 25, 4.) धारयन् C. पारयत् A. B.: cf. Satap. I. 4, 2, 2.-5, 1, 8.
- P. 137. l. 14. (IV. 25, 5.) मनायुरिद्विविषयस्तुतिकामश्च C. मनायुमनोयुक्तो यजमानः B.; omitted in A.
- P. 137. l. 15. (IV. 25, 5.) सुप्राचीः सुष्ठु प्राविता । सुप्राचीः हविं सुष्ठु प्रा विता Aa. सुप्राचीः सुष्ठु प्राविता A. सुप्राचीः हविभिः सुष्ठु प्रतर्पयिता C. सुप्राचीः सुष्ठु प्राविता B.
- P. 139. l. 14. (IV. 26, 1.) वामदेवो मनुर्भवः । A. C. वामदेवः ईद्रे वो मनुर्भवः ।
- P. 139. l. 16. (IV. 26, 1.) आर्जुनेयं to क्षुधिरहमेवास्मि given from C.; omitted in A. B. places किंच आर्जुनेयमर्जुन्याः पुत्रं कुत्समहं नृजे प्रसाधयेऽहं कविः सर्वज्ञ उशना शुक्र इति मा पश्यत after इत्युक्तं भवति.
- P. 140. l. 11. (IV. 26, 3.) चैरं अर्धसयं B. चैरं ग्रैरयं C. चैरं यं A.
- P. 142. l. 21. (IV. 27, 1.) मामरक्षन्नित्यर्थः । अधाधुना इयेनः इयेनवत्स्थितोऽहं जवसा वेगेन निरर्दीयं । शरी-  
राभिरगमं । अनावरणमात्मानं जानन्निरगितोऽस्मीत्यर्थः । C. मामरक्षन्नित्यर्थः । अधानंतरं इयेनः सन् जवसा वेगेन  
गमेत् निरर्दीयं निगैतवानस्मि । B. The whole explanation after मामरक्षन्नित्यर्थः omitted in A.
- P. 144. l. 14. (IV. 27, 5.) सोमराजस्य A. C. सोमरस्य B.
- P. 145. l. 22. (IV. 28, 3.) सर्वा सर्वाणि A. C. शर्वा सर्वाणि B. Instead of शर्वा, Sáyana read सर्वा.
- P. 150. l. 22. (IV. 30, 7.) किमित्यसंतं A. C. असंतं B.
- P. 159. l. 7. (IV. 31, 15.) Before अस्माकमुत्तमं, A. B. have तस्मा त्वं, Ca. स्मात्तै.
- P. 164. l. 7. (IV. 32, 19.) The commentary to this verse is only given in B. and Ca. A. has दश ते कलशानामित्युक् त्यक्ता.
- P. 165. l. 15. (IV. 32, 24.) यामेषु यज्ञेषु B. यामेषु गमनेषु Ca. यामेषु A.
- P. 167. l. 4. (IV. 33, 2.) From वेषेण to कर्मभिः taken from Ca. B. परिविष्टी वेषणा परिवर्ष्य  
वेषणेन दंसनाभिः स्कर्मसामर्थ्यैश्चरं etc. A. परिविष्टी परिवेषणेन परिवर्ष्य वेषणा वेषणेन व्याप्ता यद्धानंतराग्रवदे-  
वानामिन्द्रादीनां etc.
- P. 167. l. 6. (IV. 33, 2.) युवशा कर्त्तेति देवप्राप्तेः करेकांतत्वेन देवैरेकत्वादिभावः । A. °त्वादिति भावः B.  
युवस्या कर्त्तेति देवत्वप्राप्तेरुक्तोचत्वेन देवेरुक्तत्वादिति भावः । Ca.
- P. 167. l. 8. (IV. 33, 2.) मनायै चृतेन A. मनायै मतिकृते Ca.
- P. 167. l. 18. (IV. 33, 3.) चूषयः A. B. चूभवः Ca.
- P. 168. l. 2. (IV. 33, 4.) After अकुर्वन्निति यत्, Ca. adds किं मृताया गोस्वचांगसु ह्यह्य तस्या मांसं  
समयोजयन्नित्यर्थः.
- P. 168. l. 13. (IV. 33, 5.) देवत्वप्राप्त्युक्त्येन देवत्वेन तदा तेषु मध्ये एको ज्येष्ठः A. B. देवत्वप्राप्त्युक्तो  
ज्येष्ठः Ca.
- P. 168. l. 15. (IV. 33, 5.) तद्वरो कनिष्ठो वाजः B. तत्कनिष्ठस्ततोऽपि कनीयान् Ca.; omitted in A.

- P. 175. l. 9. (IV. 34, 10.) वाजवतं बलवंतं B. वाजवतमन्नवंतं C. वाजवंतं A.  
 P. 175. l. 11. (IV. 34, 10.) दातुं Ca. दत्त B. ददातु A. ददात C.  
 P. 175. l. 12. (IV. 34, 10.) रयिं after दत्त C. चृषिं A.; omitted in B.  
 P. 175. l. 19. (IV. 34, 11.) अपरक्ता A. B. अपगता C.  
 P. 175. l. 21. (IV. 34, 11.) After संमदय, तथा च मरुद्भिः संमदय should be added. B. has संमदय । मरुद्भिः राजभिः राजमानैः etc.  
 P. 177. l. 2. (IV. 35, 3.) From अथ सोऽग्निः to कुशलहस्ता यूयं from C. B. gives the following commentary: हे वाजाः सुहस्ताः शोभनहस्तोपेताः ऋभवो यूयं चमसं चतुर्धा व्यकृणोत व्यकृणु कृत्वा च हे सखे सखिभूताग्ने विशिष्येति अनुग्रहेण सोमपानमित्यब्रवीत अथ दत्त अथ यूयं अमृतस्यामरणधर्मकस्य etc.  
 P. 179. l. 8. (IV. 36, 9.) सोमदानवंतं तृतीयं A. B. सोमदानवंतं यत्तृतीयं Ca.  
 P. 179. l. 10. (IV. 36, 9.) परिषेचनवंतं A. B. परिषक्तचवनंतं Ca.  
 P. 181. l. 24. (IV. 36, 6.) स्तुत्या युक्तो C. स्तुत्या A. स्तुत्यो B.  
 P. 184. l. 5. (IV. 37, 2.) दक्षायोत्साहाय C. दक्षाय बलाय B. दक्षायोद्धादाय A.  
 P. 188. l. 13. (IV. 38, 4.) After यजमानस्य, Ca. has आप इति देवताविशेषणं । अद्भ्यः संभूत इत्यर्थः ।  
 P. 189. l. 9. (IV. 38, 6.) Instead of शुभ्वा, Sáyana explains सुभ्वा.  
 P. 190. l. 10. (IV. 38, 9.) अभिभविद्वौ जूतिं पराभिभूतिमित्युभयं वा ॥ अभिभविद्वौ जूतिं पराभिभूतिं चेत्युक्तं यं वा A. अभिभविद्वौ चेत्युक्तं य B. I. (वे B.). अभिभवतौ जूतिं पराभिभूतिं चेत्युभयं वा Ca.  
 P. 191. l. 13. (IV. 39, 1.) घासं C. घ्रासं A. Ca. वासं Aa. B.  
 P. 191. l. 13. (IV. 39, 1.) विवासयंतीः A. B. Ca.  
 P. 191. l. 15. (IV. 39, 1.) After तासां, A. Ca. have ये (or ये). B. omits several words.  
 P. 191. l. 24. (IV. 39, 2.) तारकं यं A. Ca. तारिपितारं B.  
 P. 192. l. 16. (IV. 39, 4.) यत्तदमन्महि ॥ तेदमन्महि A. Ca. यदमन्महि B.  
 P. 194. l. 11. (IV. 40, 2.) तुरख्यसत् । त्वरया सीदति added from B. इति तुरख्यसत् supplied by conjecture.  
 P. 194. l. 21. (IV. 40, 3.) वानुसृत् ॥ वानुसृग A. चानुसृत् C. वानु B.  
 P. 194. l. 24. (IV. 40, 3.) After इयेनस्येव, Ca. तस्य देवस्य.  
 P. 195. l. 7. (IV. 40, 4.) कक्षप्रदेशे C. कक्षिप्रदेशे A. कुक्षिप्रदेशे B.: cf. Rv. I. 117, 22.  
 P. 195. l. 8. (IV. 40, 4.) त्वरयति गंतुं ॥ त्वरयति गंतुः C. त्वरयितुं गंतु A. गत्वतुं यंति B.  
 P. 195. l. 24. (IV. 40, 5.) चित्तरूपस्थितः C. चितरूपस्थितः A. चिंतनूपस्थितः B. हृदि स्थितः Ca.  
 P. 195. l. 26. (IV. 40, 5.) एकीकृत्योपास्यः परमात्ममंत्रप्रतिपाद्यः C. एकीकृत्योपास्य परमात्ममंत्रप्रतिपाद्यः Aa. एकीकृत्योपरस्परमंत्रप्रतिपाद्यः A. एकीकृत्यं परस्परपरमात्ममंत्रप्रतिपाद्यः B.  
 P. 196. l. 10. (IV. 40, 5.) यज्ञो ॥ यज्ञं A. B. C.  
 P. 197. l. 4. (IV. 41, 1.) हविष्मान् हविर्युक्तः etc. B. has हविष्मान् हविर्युक्तोऽमृतोऽमरणलक्षणेन अमृतः मरणरहितो होता न स्वर्गसाधनभूतोऽग्निरिव.  
 P. 197. l. 6. (IV. 41, 1.) उक्त उदितः C. उक्तं हिते A. उक्तः अभिहितेन B.  
 P. 198. l. 10. (IV. 41, 4.) After हिंसकः, A. C. have शत्रूणां. B. omits the whole passage.  
 P. 199. l. 1. (IV. 41, 6.) तनये तपुत्रे A. C. तनये पौत्रे B.  
 P. 199. l. 5. (IV. 41, 6.) परितनके ॥ परितनके A. B. C. परितनके गमने Ca.

- P. 199. l. 24. (IV. 41, 8.) सुदानू शोभनफलदातायै added from B.
- P. 199. l. 25. (IV. 41, 8.) After कामयमानाः, A. has पञ्चये, B. यदमयः, C. पञ्चयेद्. Ca. omits it. पञ्चयो by conjecture, or पदातयो.
- P. 199. l. 25. (IV. 41, 8.) अचसे रक्षणाय inserted in B. after पञ्चयो.
- P. 199. l. 27. (IV. 41, 8.) मनस ईश्वरा A. C. मनसा इषाः (i. e. मनस ईषाः) B.
- P. 200. l. 7. (IV. 41, 9.) धनिकं स्वामिनं C. अधिकं स्वामिनां A. B.
- P. 200. l. 15. (IV. 41, 10.) रथसमूहरूपस्य C. रथरूपस्य A. B.
- P. 200. l. 16. (IV. 41, 10.) त्वनात्मना स्वयमेवाप्रयत्नेन from C.
- P. 200. l. 17. (IV. 41, 10.) अचतं A. B. भवतं C.
- P. 200. l. 25. (IV. 41, 11.) Before वाजसातौ, B. has ततोऽस्मदीये.
- P. 201. l. 15. (IV. 42, 1.) क्षितिस्वर्गभेदेन ॥ क्षितिः स्वर्गभेदेन A. B. C.
- P. 202. l. 11. (IV. 42, 3.) From तेऽप्यहमेव to द्यावापृथिव्यौ supplied from Ca.; left out in A. B. has रजसी राजमाने रोदसी द्यावापृथिव्यौ धारयं च धृतवानस्मि । किंच विद्वान् त्वष्टेव प्रजापतिरिव विश्वा सर्वैषि भुवनानि समैरयं । प्रेरयामि ॥.
- P. 202. l. 20. (IV. 42, 4.) चृतावा यज्ञवान् Ca.
- P. 202. l. 21. (IV. 42, 4.) मर्धमेव C. समर्धमेव A. B.
- P. 203. l. 6. (IV. 42, 5.) परेषामभिभाविवलोऽहं A. C. अन्येषामभिभावुकोऽहं B.
- P. 204. l. 1. (IV. 42, 7.) वृतानावृतान् B. वृतानाञ्ज्वान् A. C.
- P. 204. l. 2. (IV. 42, 7.) अप्संधान् C. अप्सुतान् A. मेधान् अप्सुतान् B.
- P. 204. l. 8. (IV. 42, 8.) अराजकं दृष्ट्वा राष्ट्रं पुरुकुत्सस्य लिप्सया B. यत्पावराजकं Ca.
- P. 204. l. 9. (IV. 42, 8.) पुनः प्रोचुः A. C. प्रतिप्रोचुः B.
- P. 204. l. 24. (IV. 42, 9.) अप्रीययत् C. प्रीणयति A. B.
- P. 205. l. 6. (IV. 42, 10.) युवां संभक्तारो वयं C. युवां सो वयं A. हविषां संभक्तारो वयं B.
- P. 205. l. 13. (IV. 43, 1.) प्रातरनुवाकाश्विनश्चन्द्रयोराश्विने C. प्रातरनुवाकाश्विने क्तौ A. B.
- P. 205. l. 23. (IV. 43, 1.) श्रेष्येम आशयेम वा ॥ श्रेष्येम शयेम वा A. श्रेष्येम वा C. श्रेष्येमाशयेम वा B. The last reading explains श्रेष्येम by आशयेम from अश्व. But Sáyana seems to give two different etymologies of श्रेष्येम, either from श्विष् or from अश्वि.
- P. 206. l. 6. (IV. 43, 2.) मूलयेदस्मान् A. C. सुखयेदस्मान् B. Sáyana explains frequently मूद् by सुखयति.
- P. 207. l. 23. (IV. 43, 6.) वेतारो गंतारो Ca.
- P. 208. l. 10. (IV. 43, 7.) गरितारं only in A.
- P. 208. l. 22. (IV. 44, 1.) गोः गवां Ca.
- P. 209. l. 7. (IV. 44, 2.) After विभक्त्यत्ययः । A. C. have समिधे, Ca. समध्ये.
- P. 209. l. 10. (IV. 44, 2.) वहंति वाहयंति Ca.
- P. 210. l. 11. (IV. 44, 5.) ईञ्जतो यजमानाः C. इञ्जमानाः A. B.
- P. 211. l. 15. (IV. 45, 1.) Sáyana has omitted युज्यते; B. reads द्योतमानस्यादितस्य सानु युज्यते वि सान्वौ समुच्छ्रितप्रदेशे etc.
- P. 211. l. 17. (IV. 45, 1.) त्रिविधाः पृश्वासोऽन्नानि । A. C. leave out पृश्वासोऽन्नानि. B. gives the whole passage in this way: त्रिविधाः मिथुना तेषां विहितं यात्र इदमन्नमज्ञानं वृश्वासः अन्नानि

सानं ख्यादयश्चेति हि श्रुतं । It seems that पृथासः अन्नानि, as युज्यते before, was inserted in B. from the margin. त्रेधा विहितं वा इदमन्नमशनं पानं खादश्चेति हि श्रुतं Ca. त्रेधा विहितं चात्र इदमन्नमशनं पानं खादयश्चेति हि श्रुतं A.

P. 213. l. 16. (IV. 45, 6.) ते वाह्भिः A. B. C.

P. 213. l. 17. (IV. 45, 6.) ध्वंसयंतो inserted from Ca., which has after रश्मयः । तो वाहभिः प्रकाशाः प्रसिद्धौ रवाहोभितावौ दविध्वतः कंपयंतो ध्वंसयाता वा तमांसि etc.

P. 220. l. 4. (IV. 49, 2.) वामास्ये चारुः शोभनः ॥ वामास्ये सोमः A. वामस्ये सोमः B 1. हे इंद्रा-बृहस्पती चारुः शोभनः B 4. sec. man. Ca. omits the whole passage.

P. 220. l. 12. (IV. 49, 3.) संबंधि ॥ संबंधिनं A. B. C. See Amara-kosha II. 2, 5.

P. 221. l. 21. (IV. 50, 1.) मंद्रजिह्वं मादनजिह्वं मोदनजिह्वं तं Ca. मंद्रजिह्वं तं A. C. मंद्रजिह्वं मंद्रा जिह्वं यस्यासौ मंद्रजिह्वः तं B.

P. 222. l. 3. (IV. 50, 2.) उपक्षिपंति A. C 2. उपाक्षिपंति B. उपक्षपयंति Ca.

P. 227. l. 25. (IV. 51, 3.) After विमध्ये, Ca. संधकारस्यांतर्मध्ये.

P. 228. l. 9. (IV. 51, 4.) तौ द्वौ तत्रयेऽपि B. ते द्वे तत्रयेऽपि A. यदौ तत्रयोऽपि Ca.

P. 229. l. 3. (IV. 51, 6.) अशोणी A. B. अजीणी Ca.

P. 229. l. 4. (IV. 51, 6.) यतः ॥ यथा A. B. C.

P. 229. l. 12. (IV. 51, 7.) ताः खलूपकारिण्यः Ca. ताः स्वरूपकारिण्यः A. °चारिण्यः B.

P. 229. l. 24. (IV. 51, 8.) देशादेकरूपादंतरिखात् Ca.

P. 229. l. 25. (IV. 51, 8.) क्षुत्विग्धविरादिकं Ca. क्षुत्विग्धशदिकं A. क्षुत्विगादिकं B.

P. 230. l. 2. (IV. 51, 8.) प्रसंगादुपकारत्वाच्च A. B. प्रसरायकारकत्वाच्च Ca.

P. 230. l. 9. (IV. 51, 9.) अहिंसितवर्णी taken from Ca.

P. 231. l. 3. (IV. 51, 11.) विभातीर्विविधभानाः Ca.

P. 232. l. 9. (IV. 52, 4.) वियुज्यमाना B. C. युज्यमाना A.

P. 232. l. 22. (IV. 52, 6.) अनु पश्चात् taken from Ca.; omitted in A. B. C 2. B. has सन्वव अनुपश्च sec. man.

P. 232. l. 24. (IV. 52, 7.) The Viniyoga is given in Ca. only.

P. 235. l. 11. (IV. 53, 5.) चंतरा द्वां न A. B. चंतरा क्षीतं Ca. Yāska, Nir. II. 10. चंतरा द्वातं भवति ।

P. 235. l. 17. (IV. 53, 5.) तिस्रो दिव इंद्रप्रजापतिसत्याख्यान् Ca. तिस्रोऽग्नेर्दिव इंद्रप्रजापतिसत्याख्यान् A. तिस्रो दिवो अग्नेर्द्विप्रजापतिरित्याख्यान् B.

P. 238. l. 2. (IV. 54, 3.) अनागसः अपापान् B.

P. 238. l. 12. (IV. 54, 4.) न प्रमीयेत् । न ग्रहिंस्वेत् A. B. न प्रमीयेत् । न ग्रहिंस्वेत् Ca.

P. 238. l. 13. (IV. 54, 4.) दैव्यस्येयधिकरणे ॥ दैव्यस्येति व्यधिकरणे A. B. C 2. दैव्यधिकरणे Ca.

P. 238. l. 16. (IV. 54, 4.) यत् यः ॥ यः B. यं । Ca. यौ A.

P. 238. l. 17. (IV. 54, 4.) सुवति प्रेरयति B.

P. 239. l. 1. (IV. 54, 5.) गच्छंतस्त्वां A. C. गच्छंतः प्राणिनस्त्वया B.

P. 239. l. 24. (IV. 55, 1.) The whole passage from कश्च वरुता संतो चारयिता is taken from Ca.

P. 240. l. 5. (IV. 55, 1.) समानाधिकरणे इति सामान्याधिकरण्यात् A. C 2. समिधिकरणे इति समानाधि-करणं यत् B. नामंति समानाधिकरणे (Pāṇ. VIII. 1, 73.) इत्यविद्यमानवत्त्वप्रतिषेधात् Ca.

P. 240. l. 16. (IV. 55, 2.) दुःखानामश्रयिताः Ca. दुःखानामश्रयिताः A. B.

P. 241. l. 1. (IV. 55, 3.) यथा wanting in A. B. C.

P. 241. l. 2. (IV. 55, 3.) तथा ॥ ह तथा A. B. C 2. यथा B. sec. man. Ca. omits the whole passage.

P. 241. l. 19. (IV. 55, 5.) इन्द्रसखस्य Ca. अद्रेसखस्य A. अद्रेः सखस्य B.

P. 243. l. 12. (IV. 56, 1.) Áśvaláyana adds इह ज्येष्ठे after मही द्यावापृथिवी.

P. 243. l. 19. (IV. 56, 1.) इह यत्ने deest in A. C.

P. 245. l. 13. (IV. 56, 6.) राजयः । ईशाने भवयः । Ca.

P. 245. l. 13. (IV. 56, 6.) शरीरैकदेशेन Ca. शरीरैकदेन A. शरीरैक्यादिना B.

P. 245. l. 14. (IV. 56, 6.) द्यौ स्त्रीयोनापरेण भुवं सा च स्वकीयेन काष्ण्येन Ca. द्यौ स्त्रीयोनासरेण भुवं सा च स्वकीयेन काष्ण्येन A 2 and 3. स्त्रीयोनापरेण A 3. sec. man. द्यौः स्त्रीयोनासरेण भुवं सा च स्वकीयेन काष्ण्येन B. सौ स्त्रीयोनासारण भुव स च स्वकीयेन काष्ण्येन C 2. द्यौः स्त्रीयोनापरेण भुवं सा च स्वकीयेन काष्ण्येन Sáyaṇa's Commentary to the Sáma-veda.

P. 247. l. 2. (IV. 57, 2.) मधुसावि सुपूतं ॥ मधुसावितं सुपूतं Ca. मधुसावित A. मधुसावि तत्. B. puts सुपूतं शोधितं after ऊर्मिं प्रवृद्धं.

P. 248. l. 8. (IV. 57, 5.) हे शुनासीरा stands before अत शुन इन्द्रः in A. B. In the quotation from Yáska, शुनो वायुः is left out in A. B. C. Sáyaṇa takes शुनासीरौ either as Indra and Váyu, or, according to the Nairuktás, as Váyu and Áditya. This is shown in verse 8. Ca. reads द्युदेवः शुनदेवतेति शौनकः । अतः शुन इन्द्रः सीरो वायुः इन्द्रवायू । हे शुनासीरा इन्द्रवायू । वायुर्दिवाविति नैरुक्ताः । शुनो वायुः शु इत्यंतरिक्षे etc. Shadguruśishya, in his Commentary on the Nirukta, writes, शुन इति वायोरभिधानं । आहुर्वृहदेवताविदः । वायुः शुनः सीरः सूर्य शुनासीरौ वायुसूर्यौ वदंति । शुनासीरमिन्द्रं यास्कस्तु मेने सूर्येन्द्रौ तु मन्यते शाकपूनिरिति पराशरः.

P. 248. l. 8. (IV. 57, 5.) शु इति A 3. pr. man. Ca. pr. man. शुन इति A. sec. man. Ca. sec. man. शुन इति A 2. शु इति B. C. शु इति Nir.

P. 249. l. 9. (IV. 57, 8.) नो भूमिं फाला भूमिविदारककाष्टाः ॥ ततः फाला भूमिविदारककाष्टाः B. ता भूमि-फालाः विदारककाष्टाः A. नो भूमिं फालाः विदारककाष्टाः Ca.

P. 249. l. 25. (IV. 58, 1.) इति वा समुद्रोऽग्निः पार्थिवः । Ca. इति वा पार्थिवः A. इति वा पार्थिवाः Ca. इति पार्थिवः B.

P. 250. l. 2. (IV. 58, 1.) ऊर्म्युत्पातकः A. ऊर्म्युत्पादकः Ca. ऊर्म्युत्पातृको B.

P. 250. l. 3. (IV. 58, 1.) समुद्रचरण B. Ca. समुद्रचरण A. C 2.

P. 250. l. 17. (IV. 58, 2.) स्तवाम ॥ सुवानो B. सुनो A. C.

P. 250. l. 19. (IV. 58, 2.) जृंगाणि दिशूपाणि वेदचतुष्टयरूपाणि वा Ca.

P. 251. l. 4. (IV. 58, 3.) स त्रयाणां वर्याणां त्रिभिर्वेदैः Ca. In Ápastamba's Paribhāshā-sūtras we have यज्ञं व्याख्यास्यामः ॥ १ ॥ स त्रयाणां वर्याणां ब्राह्मणराजन्ययोर्वैश्यस्य च ॥ २ ॥ स त्रिभिर्वेदैर्विधीयते ॥ ३ ॥ See Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, vol. IX, page xliii, "Über die Todtenbestattung bei den Brahmanen von Max Müller."

P. 251. l. 11. (IV. 58, 3.) महो दवः एष यज्ञात्मा महानुभावदेवः Ca.

P. 251. l. 14. (IV. 58, 3.) एत अयणार्थत्वात् A. एव अयणार्थत्वात् C. and Aa. pr. man. एव अयणार्थत्वात् Aa. sec. man. एवाअयणार्थत्वात् A. एवः अयणार्थत्वात् Ca.

- P. 251. l. 20. (IV. 58, 3.) अग्न्याद्यात्मकत्वेन संबद्धः Ca. अग्न्याद्यात्मकत्वेन संबंधः A. B.  
 P. 252. l. 16. (IV. 58, 5.) अस्मभवो Ca. अयः संभवो A. B.  
 P. 252. l. 25. (IV. 58, 6.) अस्याग्नेः उपरि ॥ उपरि deest in A. B.  
 P. 253. l. 19. (IV. 58, 7.) स यथा काष्ठा भिन्दन् Ca.  
 P. 254. l. 11 and 13. (IV. 58, 9.) व्यंजयंतः instead of व्यंजयंतीः, a mistake of frequent occurrence in Sāyana.  
 P. 255. l. 2. (IV. 58, 11.) तदंते इति वृत्ता C. तदंते इति व्यचा A. तदंते घृताची B.  
 P. 255. l. 8. (IV. 58, 11.) विश्वं भुवनमधिष्ठितं B. विश्वं भुवनं कृत्स्नं भूतजातमधिष्ठितं । आश्रितं । तदपि च धाम कुतः कुत्रासू इति ॥ उच्यते । Ca. ; deest in A. C 2.  
 P. 255. l. 8. (IV. 58, 11.) अंतः समुद्रे वडवाग्निनत्वेन B. अंतः समुद्रे अंतरिक्षस्य मध्ये सूर्यमंडलत्वेन Ca. ; deest in A. C 2.

## Maṇḍala V.

- P. 257. l. 13. (V. 1, 3.) तदा B. यदैव C. यद्व A.  
 P. 257. l. 26. (V. 1, 4.) विरूपे नानारूपे Ca.  
 P. 260. l. 4. (V. 1, 9.) यस्मै यज्ञाय B.  
 P. 260. l. 6. (V. 1, 9.) मानुषीणां यजमानरूपाणां Ca.  
 P. 260. l. 15. (V. 1, 10.) महि of the text is left unexplained in A. C. वृहन्महत् महि भद्रं महत्सुखं च B.  
 P. 261. l. 23. (V. 2, 1.) इक्ष्वाकुः A. B. रेक्ष्वाकः C.  
 P. 262. l. 5. (V. 2, 1.) रागात् C. वेगात् A. B.  
 P. 262. l. 9. (V. 2, 1.) एवं गायन् स ऋषिर्ब्रह्महत्यां भार्यी जातां C. एवं गायन् । ऋषिर्ब्रह्महत्यां भार्याजातां A. एवं गायन् स ऋषि ब्रह्महत्यां भार्याजातां B.  
 P. 262. l. 11. (V. 2, 1.) सम्यक् तद्वस्त्रोषयित्वा C. सकस्त्रोषयित्वा A. संस्त्रो तोषयित्वा B.  
 P. 262. l. 13. (V. 2, 1.) धारयन् A. C. धारयन् B.  
 P. 262. l. 21. (V. 2, 1.) निहितं स्थितं B. स्थितं C. ; deest in A.  
 P. 262. l. 21. (V. 2, 1.) पुरः पुरोदेशे Ca. पुरः B. ; deest in A.  
 P. 263. l. 4. (V. 2, 1.) कशिपुना ह्वयं B. Ca. pr. man. कशिपुना ह्वयं A. Ca. sec. man.  
 P. 263. l. 9. (V. 2, 2.) कुमारजननं A. B. कुमारं जननं B. pr. man. कुमारं हननं B. sec. man. कुमारमातृ C.  
 P. 264. l. 2. (V. 2, 4.) अरण्यं C. आरण्यं A. B.  
 P. 264. l. 22. (V. 2, 6.) मर्त्येषु तदीयेषु लोकेषु Ca.  
 P. 264. l. 26. (V. 2, 6.) अत्रैवैवाणि ॥ अत्रा ब्रह्माणि A. C. अत्र ब्रह्माणि B.  
 P. 265. l. 1. (V. 2, 6.) प्राणमयं ॥ श्राणं मेगं Aa. B. C. श्राणं तेगं A.  
 P. 265. l. 11. (V. 2, 7.) अनेकरूपाद्युपात् Ca. अनेकयुपात् A. B.  
 P. 265. l. 14. (V. 2, 7.) स्तुतिकर्मैतत् ॥ स्तुतिकर्मैतात् Ca. pr. man. स्तुतिकर्मैत्वात् A. B. C.  
 P. 266. l. 20. (V. 2, 10.) भंगं B. यावां A. यासं C.  
 P. 268. l. 21. (V. 3, 3.) अयो taken from B. ; deest in A. C.  
 P. 268. l. 22. (V. 3, 3.) उद्वावर्धितराग्रे C. रुद्रावर्धितराग्रे A. रुद्रवर्धितराग्रे B.

P. 268. l. 24. (V. 3, 3.) अगम्यं A. अचक्षुर्गम्यं C. गम्यं B.

P. 269. l. 17. (V. 3, 5.) अतिथिवत्पूज्यो भवसि from Ca. भवसि B.; omitted in A. C.

P. 271. l. 7. (V. 3, 9.) पुत्रस्थानीयः पुरुषाता वा Ca.

P. 272. l. 13. (V. 3, 12.) वसवे वासकाय C. वसवे वासका A. वसवे धनार्थं वासकाः B.

P. 272. l. 13. (V. 3, 12.) अवाचि before उक्तवान् omitted by A. C.; B. puts it after अगोऽपरार्थं.

P. 272. l. 26. (V. 4, 1.) वृत्त्यवृत्तिभ्यां A. वृत्त्यवृत्तिभ्यां B. C.: cf. Pāṇ. II. 1, 3.

P. 274. l. 19. (V. 4, 5.) दुरोणे not explained in A. B. C.

P. 275. l. 6. (V. 4, 6.) तपैयसि पाहि A. B. C. तपैयसि तर्हि?

P. 275. l. 21. (V. 4, 8.) दिव्यादिषु A. B. क्षियादिषु C.

P. 276. l. 18. (V. 4, 10.) त्वामन्नप्रदं मन्यमानो Ca.

P. 276. l. 19. (V. 4, 10.) क्रीरिणाशब्देन A. B. C.

P. 278. l. 7. (V. 5, 4.) The Sanhitās write, both here and X. 18, 10, ऊर्णसदाः.

P. 280. l. 14. (V. 6, 1.) Áśvaláyana has between the two verses a third: आ ते वत्सो

मनो यमत्.

P. 283. l. 20. (V. 6, 9.) पचसि वा C. वसि वा A. सेवसि वा B.

P. 284. l. 1. (V. 6, 10.) अनुपक्तं संबद्धं Ca.

P. 284. l. 2. (V. 6, 10.) यज्ञे सुत्या सुवर्ति after स्थापयति Ca.

P. 284. l. 3. (V. 6, 10.) निर्दिशति। अनुयैषु—यस्य भवति Ca. निर्दिशति। अनुयैवा अश्वा यस्य भवति A. निर्दिशति किंच अस्मे अस्मासु सुवीर्यं शोभनपुत्रादिकं उतापि च तत् आश्वश्च आश्वो अश्वा यस्य भवति B.

P. 285. l. 10. (V. 7, 3.) द्योतमानस्यान्नस्य A. B. द्योतमानस्या Ca. द्योतमानस्याग्नेः C.

P. 285. l. 12. (V. 7, 3.) स्त्रीकरोति। A. B. स्त्रीकरोमि C.

P. 286. l. 13. (V. 7, 6.) स्पृहणीयमग्निं A. B. C.

P. 286. l. 14. (V. 7, 7.) व्याप्यर्थं A. C. व्यापारार्थं B.

P. 288. l. 2. (V. 7, 10.) अग्निजः after व्यतिरिक्तैः added in A. B. C.

P. 289. l. 1. (V. 8, 2.) वृक्षाणां A. C. रक्षसां B.

From here B. gives only an extract of the commentary, leaving out all that does not belong materially to the explanation of the text, especially all grammatical rules and quotations from Yáska.

P. 293. l. 9. (V. 9, 1.) शिष्टाः पञ्चतस्य च सूक्तस्येति परिभाषया अनुपुनः Ca.

P. 293. l. 20. (V. 9, 1.) B. has only the last explanation: ज्ञातं वेदो धनं यस्यासौ ज्ञातवेदाः.

P. 294. l. 1. (V. 9, 1.) मनिरत्नं left out in B. The whole grammatical explanation from हविष्यन्तः to the end of the verse is omitted in B.

P. 295. l. 3. (V. 9, 2.) यजमानप्रभृतीनां Aa. यजमानस्य प्रभृतां Ca. यजमानप्रभृतां A. यजमानस्य B.

P. 295. l. 26. (V. 9, 3.) After इत्याकारलोपः, Ca. adds नि धान्ये नि (उ° १. ९.) अस्मात्पूत्राद्विदित्यनुवर्तते।

P. 299. l. 11. (V. 10, 1.) नस् व्यापनं यस्य तत्तथोक्तं ॥ नस् व्यापनं यस्य तथोक्तं A. C.

P. 302. l. 25. (V. 10, 6.) बहुलवचनत्वेऽलोपाभावः ॥ बहुलवचनत्वे लोपाभावः A. Ca. बहुलवचनान्नलो-

पाभावः C 2. : cf. Pán. VI. 4, 136. and Rv. VI. 15, 6. It may be meant for बहुलवचनान्न-लोपाभावः; cf. Pán. III. 3, 1.

P. 305. l. 2. (V. 11, 2.) मधोदाज्ञः ॥ अंतोदाज्ञः । A. Ca.

P. 308. l. 4. (V. 12, 3.) नवेदाः ज्ञाता भुवः भवेः C 2. नवेदाः भुवः Ca. नवेदाः भुवः भवेः A. नवेदाः भुवः न वेत्तासि B.

P. 308. l. 5. (V. 12, 3.) अतूनामृतपा वसंतादीनां पालकः B.

P. 313. l. 25. (V. 15, 2.) ते यजमानाः ॥ ये यजमानाः A. B. Ca.

P. 315. l. 3. (V. 15, 6.) तायुरिति स्तेननाम । पदमिव आत्मीयं मार्गमिव गुहा गुहायां दधानः आत्मनः शत्रूणां प्रकाशं निदधानः A. in margine, and C 2. which leaves out आत्मनः; Ca. and Aa. omit the whole passage. तायुर्न तस्करो यथा गुहायां पदं द्रव्यं दधानः धारयन् रक्षति तद्वत् B.

P. 333. l. 16. (V. 25, 9.) अस्माकं बलमाचरंतं A. शत्रुनाशकं B.; left out in Ca.

P. 341. l. 16. (V. 29, 1.) From संति to तेजांसि from B. संति रोचनं रोचना रोचमानानि वायुग्नि-सूर्यात्मकानि दिव्या दिव्यानि अंतरिक्षे भवानि तानि तेजांसि Ca.; left out in A.

P. 341. l. 18. (V. 29, 1.) शुद्धबला A. Ca. भद्रबला B.

P. 341. l. 26. (V. 29, 2.) ततो A. तथा B. तयोः Ca.

P. 342. l. 21. (V. 29, 4.) व्ययतेवै ॥ वेतेवै A. व्येतेवै Ca.

P. 343. l. 7. (V. 29, 5.) बह्मपादयः A. Ca. अग्न्यादयः B.

P. 343. l. 11. (V. 29, 5.) स्वश्चपुत्रेण ॥ स्वभावे A. स्वभावेन Ca.

P. 347. l. 19. (V. 29, 15.) शूरतम वेदं हि निगमः A. Ca.; left out in B. [It is probable that before हि निगमः a quotation from the Veda was left out.]

P. 348. l. 14. (V. 30, 1.) शोभनश्चद्वारो Ca. शोभनाख्यद्वारो A. शोभनरथो यस्य etc. B.

P. 349. l. 11. (V. 30, 3.) विद्वान् before शृणवच्च added by conjecture. नः असमदीयानि यानि क्रीडाणि मुद्रोषः अनुष्ठितानि तानि विद्वान् जनः वेदं जानातु अविद्वान् जनः शृणवच्च शृणुयात् B.

P. 349. l. 22. (V. 30, 4.) वेपि गच्छसि B.

P. 350. l. 17. (V. 30, 6.) वदंति A. C. चरंति B. Ca.

P. 356. l. 17. (V. 31, 5.) अभिषवपाषाणाः Ca. B. अभिषवणपाषाणाः A.

P. 357. l. 14. (V. 31, 7.) युवतीः पवनाः A. यवनाः Ca.; left out in B. कपदान्?

P. 357. l. 15. (V. 31, 7.) समीपं वा ॥ समीप A. Ca.; left out in B.

P. 357. l. 22. (V. 31, 8.) पारे A. पार Ca. पारः B.; left out in C 2. Sáyana mistook पार in the Sanhitá for a locative.

P. 366. l. 17. (V. 33, 2.) अनु after प्रीति is left out in A. Ca.; B. puts it after प्र.

P. 366. l. 25. (V. 33, 3.) यत् । सुपो लोपः । ये Ca.

P. 367. l. 9. (V. 33, 4.) हे इंद्र वृषा कामानां वर्षकस्त्वं सूर्याय चित्सूर्यं च स ओकसि स्वस्थाने चकथ कृतवानसि । किंच ते तव यद्यदा स्मृतानि पुरु पुरुणि बहून्पुक्पोक्थानि शस्त्राणि संति तदोर्वेरासु शस्योपेतासु भूमिषु गवे वृष्टुदकाय युध्यन् जलप्रतिबंधकात् ततश्चे संपादयसि समत्सु B. From संहर्त्तु to वर्धिता सन् left out in Ca.

P. 367. l. 20. (V. 33, 5.) Instead of कीदृशा वयं, B. has ते सत्त्वा प्राणिनो वयं.

P. 368. l. 20. (V. 33, 7.) उक्तलक्षणेन ॥ सूक्तलक्षणेन A. Ca.; left out in B.



P. 369. l. 15. (V. 33, 9.) अश्वा दाने विनियुक्ता A. अश्वाः । विदथस्य वेदनसाधनस्य यज्ञस्य रातौ दाने विनियुक्ता B. Ca.

P. 370. l. 25. (V. 34, 2.) सहस्रभृष्टिं । Sáyana reads सहस्रभृष्टिः ।

P. 371. l. 1. (V. 34, 3.) See for this verse Yáska Nir. VI. 19.

P. 371. l. 24. (V. 34, 4.) पित्रादिवध ॥ पित्रादिधन A. पित्रादिवत् Ca. B.

P. 373. l. 3. (V. 34, 7.) वणिज इव ॥ वणिजमिव A. वणिजंम Ca.; left out in B.

P. 373. l. 6. (V. 34, 7.) पुरु पुरुणि ॥ पुरु पुरुणि A. पुरु पुरुणि महति Ca.; left out in B.

P. 373. l. 26. } (V. 34, 9.) अग्निवेशिसुतं ॥ अग्निवेशिसुतं A. Ca. आग्निवेशिसुतं B.

P. 374. l. 1. }

P. 375. l. 12. (V. 35, 3.) अद्य यज्ञं A. अस्मद्यज्ञं Ca.

P. 378. l. 16. (V. 36, 3.) स्तोषयति A. B. Ca.

P. 379. l. 7. (V. 36, 5.) दीव्यतेवा ॥ दीव्यते: A. B. Ca.

P. 380. l. 20. (V. 37, 2.) पत्नेजनी: A. Ca. अवनेजनी: B.

P. 383. l. 2. (V. 38, 3.) मरुत्समूह: A. मरुत्सह: Ca. मरुत्संग: B.

P. 384. l. 15. (V. 39, 2.) द्युक्षमन्नं A. द्युक्षमन्नं वा Ca. द्युक्षं धनं B.

P. 387. l. 9. (V. 40, 4.) योऽस्ति C. Mill. अस्ति A. B. Ca.

P. 388. l. 15. (V. 40, 7.) तव स्वभूतं B. स्वभूतं A. Ca.

P. 388. l. 25. (V. 40, 8.) मामिहावतमितुपशिष्यन् only in B.

P. 389. l. 2. (V. 40, 8.) पूजयन्नमसा मन्त्रैः ॥ पूजयन्नमन्त्रैः A. Ca. पूजयन् मन्त्रैः C. पूजयन् नमनसा नमोन्त्रैः B. (मन्त्रैः?)

P. 389. l. 4. (V. 40, 8.) स्वाश्रयमया A. Ca. The whole explanation left out in B.

P. 389. l. 8. (V. 40, 8.) अपनोद्य ॥ अपोद्य A. Ca.

P. 389. l. 17. (V. 40, 9.) Instead of निगतव्याख्येया, B. has यं सूर्यमार्यमासुरः स्वभौतुलमसाविध्यत् आतृणोत् वै खलु. What follows is taken from B. अन्वविन्दन् इन्द्रार्थं सोमयागदेवतास्तुतिनमस्कारैः (सोमयागे देवो B.) । अनुक्रमेण ईषदीयत् (ईषत् only once in B.) तमो विरुध्य लब्धवन्त इत्यर्थः ॥ A. Ca.

P. 390. l. 6. (V. 41, 1.) दे वा हविर्दत्ते च from B., which has देव हविर्दत्ति च.

P. 390. l. 8. (V. 41, 1.) प्रयच्छर्थं A. C. प्रयच्छतं B.

P. 391. l. 1. (V. 41, 3.) धर्मिग्रहणं C. धर्मिणं A. Ca.

P. 391. l. 14. (V. 41, 4.) सोढा A. B. Ca. सोढा वा C. Mill.

P. 391. l. 16. (V. 41, 4.) समानगतिः from C.

P. 392. l. 1. (V. 41, 5.) स्तोतालि Ca.

P. 392. l. 2. (V. 41, 5.) होता रवैः A. होता होताति: रवैः B. Ca.

P. 392. l. 13. (V. 41, 6.) प्र देवं A. B. C.

P. 392. l. 15. (V. 41, 6.) स्तुत ॥ स्तुतिं A. B. Ca.

P. 392. l. 23. (V. 41, 7.) वंदनार्हैः चितयद्भिः चतयद्भिः अर्कैः अर्चनीयैः श्रूयैः सुखकरैः इतरैः देवैः सह अंतर्हितां अविशेषेण सर्वप्रदेशात् च: युष्मभ्यं उपप्रेषे हविः उपप्रापयामि हे उक्तेदेवते etc. B. This explanation of B. is referred to in A. and C. उपप्रापयामि अर्कै हविः A. Ca. omits all between उपप्रापयामि and हे उक्तेदेवते.

P. 393. l. 21. (V. 41, 9.) पूराखवंतो A. C. पूरखवंतो B. Ca.

- P. 393. l. 26. (V. 41, 9.) अभिष्टौ अष्टौ अभितः एषो B.
- P. 394. l. 6. (V. 41, 10.) पर्जन्यस्य A. पर्जन्यस्य वा C. Mill; left out in B. Ca.
- P. 394. l. 10. (V. 41, 10.) अग्निः किंच भूमेऽग्निरेतरि A. अग्निरेतरि B. Ca.
- P. 395. l. 19. (V. 41, 13.) परिहरन्नावयन्ति A. B. परिहरन्तो वयन्ति Ca.
- P. 396. l. 1. (V. 41, 14.) अपसा deest in B.
- P. 398. l. 8. (V. 41, 19.) अथवा उर्वशी माध्यमिकी वाक् only in B. Ca.
- P. 398. l. 11. (V. 41, 19.) वा after उदकस्य by conjecture. Yāska has not तेजसो, but ज्योतिषो. Cf. MS. Paris. and E. I. H.
- P. 400. l. 5. (V. 42, 3.) हिरण्यानि A. Ca. सुवर्णानि B.
- P. 400. l. 12. (V. 42, 4.) अस्मभ्यं गा दापयसि A. अस्मान् गाः प्रापयसि B. Ca.
- P. 402. l. 23. (V. 42, 10.) आसुरं B. Ca. आसुक्ता A.
- P. 402. l. 25. (V. 42, 10.) पुनः पुनः प्रकृतिषु Ca.
- P. 403. l. 14. (V. 42, 11.) चारिष्ठस्य A. वा रिष्ठस्य Ca. वातिरिक्तस्य A. व्यतिरिक्तस्य Ca. The whole passage left out in C. Mill, B.
- P. 403. l. 25. (V. 42, 12.) दानमनसो वा A. दांतमनसो वा Ca. दांतमनसः B. C. (Mill) has a lacuna to verse 16.
- P. 404. l. 1. (V. 42, 12.) इंद्रस्य A. रुद्रस्य B. Ca.
- P. 405. l. 8. (V. 42, 15.) रुद्रेण left out in Ca.
- P. 406. l. 22. (V. 43, 1.) तदर्थं only in A.
- P. 407. l. 9. (V. 43, 2.) सुहस्ता अभिमतदानेन शोभनहस्ताः Ca. सुहस्ता शोभनहस्ता B.; deest in A.
- P. 407. l. 16. (V. 43, 3.) चकृवांसः कुवौणाः A. चकृवांसः संपादकाः B. चकृवांसः Ca.
- P. 408. l. 7. (V. 43, 4.) स च अंशुः अध्वर्युः B.
- P. 409. l. 26. (V. 43, 8.) यातं A. C. गंतुं B.
- P. 410. l. 2. (V. 43, 8.) तस्माद्युवमायातमागच्छतं B. at the end.
- P. 410. l. 9. (V. 43, 9.) उक्तगुणकाय A. Ca. उक्तलक्षणाय B.
- P. 410. l. 9. (V. 43, 9.) नम इति वचनं A. Ca. Some words may be left out.
- P. 410. l. 24. (V. 43, 10.) अवयवित्या Ca. अवयव्या A.
- P. 411. l. 22. (V. 43, 12.) स यथा संतं A. स यथा स तं Ca.; left out in B.
- P. 411. l. 24. (V. 43, 12.) हिरण्यवर्णी हितरमणीयवर्णी Ca.
- P. 412. l. 8. (V. 43, 13.) ग्ना गंदीज्जालास्ताभिर्गुक्ता ओषधीर्वसानो निवासभूतः B.
- P. 412. l. 17. (V. 43, 14.) रास्मी A. B. C.
- P. 412. l. 19. (V. 43, 14.) खंजते A. भजते B. Ca.
- P. 412. l. 19. (V. 43, 14.) अगमन् । आगमन् । भजते । रातहव्या दत्तहविष्का आयवो मनुष्या यजमाना नमसा नमस्कारेण अगमन् । दृष्टांतः । सुशेयं सुखाय हितं etc. B. Ca. omits all between the first वासाय and वासाय मृजंति.
- P. 413. l. 4. (V. 43, 15.) पत्नीभिः B. Ca. दंपतीभिः A.
- P. 413. l. 6. (V. 43, 16.) B. gives instead of अवशिष्टं गतं the explanation, देवो देवः सर्वोऽपि देवो मह्यं मदर्थं सुहवो भूतु । स्वाहानो भवतु । नोऽस्मान्दुर्नैतो या पृथिवी मा धातु । मा ख्यापयतु ॥
- P. 413. l. 15. (V. 43, 17.) B. gives the same commentary as V. 42, 18.

- P. 414. l. 4. (V. 44. 1.) ऐंद्री च शुक्लंयिनौ A. शुक्लंयिनौ Ca.  
 P. 414. l. 5. (V. 44. 1.) भवति Ca. भवतः A.  
 P. 414. l. 6. (V. 44. 1.) सवनस्य A. Ca. मधुष्युत Ca. मंघिवत A.  
 P. 414. l. 8. (V. 44. 1.) इति च याज्या चैद्री A. इति याज्या चैद्री Ca.  
 P. 414. l. 12. (V. 44. 1.) लंभयितारं A. फलं भावयितारं Ca.; omitted in B.  
 P. 414. l. 15. (V. 44. 1.) इत्यंतरातमनः प्रेषः only in B. Ca.  
 P. 415. l. 10. (V. 44. 3.) सत्फलसाधनत्वात् A. सत्फलत्वात् B. Ca.  
 P. 415. l. 16. (V. 44. 3.) अरिष्टगमनत्वं A. इष्टगमनत्वं B. Ca.  
 P. 415. l. 25. (V. 44. 4.) यज्ञगमने A. गमने B.; left out in Ca.  
 P. 416. l. 1. (V. 44. 4.) नामकानुदकानि A. उदकानि B.; left out in Ca.  
 P. 416. l. 4. (V. 44. 4.) वः पूरणः B. at the end of the verse.  
 P. 416. l. 11. (V. 44. 5.) कुत्सितावयवाशाखावंतं B.  
 P. 416. l. 12. (V. 44. 5.) गृभ्णन् गृह्णन् A. गृभ्णान् B. गृभ्णन् Ca.  
 P. 416. l. 25. (V. 44. 6.) रयिं from A.  
 P. 417. l. 22. (V. 44. 8.) भजते यजते A.  
 P. 417. l. 23. (V. 44. 8.) गमनशीलस्य only in A.  
 P. 417. l. 24. (V. 44. 8.) विष्टं A. विशिष्टं Ca.  
 P. 417. l. 26. (V. 44. 8.) यादृशं कामं B.  
 P. 418. l. 10. (V. 44. 9.) अत्रगच्छति B. Ca. अभिगच्छति A.  
 P. 418. l. 24. (V. 44. 10.) रमणीयाभिः स्तुतिभिर्मनोरथैः स्पृ° B.  
 P. 419. l. 7. (V. 44. 11.) शीघ्रं पातृसंकाशं गंता Ca. शीघ्रं यातृसंकाशं गंता B. शीघ्रं मातृसंकाशं गंता A.  
 P. 419. l. 8. (V. 44. 11.) कस्यपूरकश्च A. Ca. पूरकश्च B.  
 P. 419. l. 19. (V. 44. 12.) युष्माभिर्देवैः सहित B.  
 P. 419. l. 21. (V. 44. 12.) भवतीति A. भातीति B. Ca.  
 P. 420. l. 2. (V. 44. 13.) स च to धेनू left out in Ca. यो विश्वासां सर्वासां धियां स्तुतीनामूधः  
 स्थानं देवसंयमुदंचनः सेवमानः स यजमानस्यावत्सारस्य मम सुतंभरो यागनिर्वाहक एतका क्षुधिः सत्यतिः सतां विद्य-  
 मानानां फलानां पालयिता दाता भवतीत्यर्थः । धेनुः etc. B.  
 P. 420. l. 5. (V. 44. 13.) चास्य सामर्थ्यात् A. वा सामर्थ्यात् Ca. सामर्थ्यात् B.  
 P. 420. l. 5. (V. 44. 13.) संकीर्तयन् A. कीर्तयन् B. Ca.  
 P. 420. l. 6. (V. 44. 13.) सुतंभरस्यादृश इति A. सुतंभरस्यादृश इति Ca. सुतंभरश्चादृश इति B.  
 P. 420. l. 21. (V. 44. 15.) The Sanhitā MSS., S. 1. 2. 3, add after 15. the following  
 verse, which does not exist in the Padas, is not counted in the Anukramanikā,  
 and not explained by Śāyana:

जागर्धि त्वं भुवने जातवेदो जागर्धि यत् यजते हविष्मान् ।

इदं हविः अहधानो जुहोमि तेन पासि गुह्यं नाम गोनीं ॥

S. Bodl. 439. परिशिष्टं । जागर्धि गोनीं । Not in 436.

P. 421. l. 7. (V. 45. 1.) अवेदयत् A. अवेदयः B. Ca.

P. 421. l. 7. (V. 45. 1.) गा इति संबन्धः निगूढाः A. Ca. गा इति संबन्धः B.

- P. 421. l. 9. (V. 45, 1.) रक्षकाणामुपरि भेदनाय चायत्याः etc. B.  
 P. 421. l. 11. (V. 45, 1.) सखशीलः Ca. सखशीलः A. रक्षशीलः B.  
 P. 421. l. 21. (V. 45, 2.) व्युच्छेदनं A. व्युच्छेन B. Ca.  
 P. 421. l. 25. (V. 45, 2.) स्थापिता रूपिता Ca.  
 P. 421. l. 26. (V. 45, 2.) सूर्यस्याज्ञयेति A. सूर्यस्य ज्ञापयतीति B. Ca.  
 P. 422. l. 16. (V. 45, 4.) यद्यवैकमेव पदं मध्ये व्यवधाश्छांदसः । A. अथ चैकमेव पदं मध्ये व्यवधानं छांदसं Ca.  
 P. 423. l. 3. (V. 45, 5.) संभक्षणे B. Ca. संभक्षन् A.  
 P. 423. l. 5. (V. 45, 5.) विवेकः A. विशेषः Ca.  
 P. 423. l. 5. (V. 45, 5.) प्रांचः only in B.  
 P. 423. l. 18. (V. 45, 6.) बहुफलाकांक्षी कक्षीवान् A. बहुफलाकांक्षावन् Ca. बहुकांक्षवान् B.  
 P. 424. l. 4. (V. 45, 7.) क्षपरे A. क्षपरे Ca.  
 P. 424. l. 6. (V. 45, 7.) वा from Ca.  
 P. 424. l. 15. (V. 45, 8.) गवामावरकेऽंधकारेऽपवृते सति only in A.  
 P. 425. l. 1. (V. 45, 9.) सन् श्येनः A.  
 P. 425. l. 20. (V. 45, 11.) क्षपनिमित्तां Ca. क्षपां निमित्तां B.; left out in A.  
 P. 425. l. 22. (V. 45, 11.) समनुतिष्ठंतः B. Ca. सर्वैस्त्वमनुतिष्ठंतः A.  
 P. 426. l. 9. (V. 46, 1.) सुत्रः B. Ca.  
 P. 426. l. 9. (V. 46, 1.) प्रतिक्षतः left out in B. Ca.  
 P. 426. l. 11. (V. 46, 1.) रक्षपित्तौ A. रक्षमिच्छन्ती B.; left out in Ca.  
 P. 426. l. 13. (V. 46, 1.) मम को भारोच्यते देवोच्यते Ca. मम को भारो च्येति तदेवेच्यते A.  
 P. 430. l. 15. (V. 47, 1.) व्युच्छा दुहितर्दिवः । The only passage where these words occur in the Rig-veda is I. 48, 1: but nothing is said there on the mutual relation of Dyaus and Ushas. A. has दुहितुर्दिवः.  
 P. 430. l. 17. (V. 47, 1.) वोषसो A. Ca.  
 P. 430. l. 17. (V. 47, 1.) शुदुहितृत्वं Ca. दुहितृत्वं A.  
 P. 430. l. 19. (V. 47, 1.) दृश्यते A. उपदिश्यते Ca.  
 P. 431. l. 19. (V. 47, 3.) पूर्वस्य । अथयवलक्षणेय ॥ पूर्वस्यावलक्षणीयं । Ca. पूर्व वयवलक्षणेय । A.  
 P. 432. l. 4. (V. 47, 4.) हविभिः स्तुतिभिश्च only in B. Ca.  
 P. 432. l. 5. (V. 47, 4.) गमयति A. स्वरसमियति B. Ca.  
 P. 432. l. 17. (V. 47, 5.) निमौतुः only in A.  
 P. 433. l. 13. (V. 47, 7.) गाधं स्थितिं B. Ca. गाधं स्तुतिं A. (Rv. I. 61, 11.)  
 P. 434. l. 3. (V. 48, 1.) स्वं only in A.  
 P. 434. l. 15. (V. 48, 2.) चित्तन्वति A. चित्त्वन्ति B. Ca.  
 P. 434. l. 18. (V. 48, 2.) जगदन्नत A. जगदावृतं B. जगन्नदा Ca.  
 P. 434. l. 18. (V. 48, 2.) वृक्षमुखीः B. Ca.  
 P. 435. l. 2. (V. 48, 3.) आगत्यात्ता सामः A. आगत्या सोमः ॥ Ca. आगत्य सोमी B.  
 P. 435. l. 17. (V. 48, 4.) कथयाम्यहं B. Ca. कथयेयं स्तोत्रं A.  
 P. 437. l. 1. (V. 49, 2.) सविनुः only in A.

- P. 437. l. 2. (V. 49, 2.) आयोर्मेनुष्याय A. आयोर्मेनुष्यस्य B. Ca.  
P. 437. l. 3. (V. 49, 2.) गतं A. Ca. गतवतं B. गमयतं?  
P. 437. l. 4. (V. 49, 2.) स्तोतुं A. B. Ca.  
P. 437. l. 18. (V. 49, 3.) शोभनीयानि B. Ca. शोभनानि A.  
P. 438. l. 18. (V. 50, 1.) वैश्वदेवशस्त्रे वैश्वदेस्येति Ca. वैश्वदेवशस्त्रे आद्यस्तृचो वैश्वदेवे A.  
P. 438. l. 19. (V. 50, 1.) The second Viniyoga given from A. has not been found in the 7th book of Áśvaláryana.  
P. 438. l. 19. (V. 50, 1.) Ca. has a lacuna of some lines after द्वितीयचतुर्थे°.  
P. 439. l. 1. (V. 50, 1.) The beginning in B. is quite different: देवस्य द्योतमानस्य नेतुः प्रापकस्य सवितुः सख्यं वृणीत अतः वृणीत मतः विश्वमरणथनीत्मकः सर्वे जनाः राये धनस्य etc.  
P. 439. l. 2. (V. 50, 1.) ईशीत A. ईशे B. Ca.  
P. 439. l. 10. (V. 50, 2.) तेऽपि त्वदीयाः A. तेऽपि मे मदीयाः सतु Ca. तेऽपि मदीयाः संतु B.  
P. 439. l. 13. (V. 50, 2.) उभये not in A.  
P. 439. l. 24. (V. 50, 3.) प्रयच्छत from Ca.  
P. 440. l. 21. (V. 51, 1.) सममं ॥ षष्ठं A. B. Ca.  
P. 441. l. 22. (V. 51, 1.) अभिषवण° A. अभिषवण° B. Ca.  
P. 442. l. 10. (V. 51, 6.) ऐंद्रवायवतृचे Ca. ऐंद्रवायस्तृचः A.  
P. 442. l. 19. (V. 51, 6.) अन्नरूपान् Ca. अन्नरूपान्वा A.  
P. 445. l. 16. (V. 51, 14.) हे पथ्ये पंथाः पथ्या खस्ति देवि अंतरिक्षमार्गः तत्त A. हे पथ्ये पथ्या खस्ति देवि पंथा अंतरिक्षमार्गः ॥ तत्त Ca. हे पथ्ये देवं पंथा अंतरिक्षमार्गः तत्त B. Cf. Nir. XI. 45: पथ्याखस्तिः पंथा अंतरिक्षं तन्निवासात् ।  
P. 445. l. 17. (V. 51, 14.) यथा अभिमुखी तादृशी etc. B. after °मानिनी देवी ।  
P. 446. l. 5. (V. 51, 15.) प्रयासकोपेन ॥ प्रयासकोपेन A. Ca.  
P. 446. l. 7. (V. 51, 15.) At the end of the hymn the Sanhitá MSS. give the following Khila; S. 1. and S. Colebr. in the margin, S. 2. in the text:  
स्वस्ययनं तार्क्ष्यमरिष्टनेमिं महद्भूतं वायसं देवतानां ।  
असुरमिन्द्रसखं समत्सु बृहद्यशो नार्वमिवा रुहेम ॥ १ ॥  
अंहोमुचंमांगिरसं गयं च स्वस्यात्रियं मनसा च तार्क्ष्यं ।  
प्रयंतपाणिः शरणं प्र पद्ये खस्ति संवाधेध्वभयं नो अस्तु ॥ २ ॥  
P. 446. l. 20. (V. 52, 1.) अनुष्वयं प्रयहं हविलं° B. प्रतिहं विलं° Ca. प्रति हविलं° A.  
P. 446. l. 21. (V. 52, 1.) स्वधानु A. Ca.; left out in B.  
P. 447. l. 21. (V. 52, 4.) किं A. किंच B. and Ca. by the same mistake.  
P. 448. l. 25. (V. 52, 7.) वृजने वा बले योगे A. वृजने बले Ca.; left out in B. Perhaps बले ये च.  
P. 449. l. 10. (V. 52, 8.) उदकार्यं A. उदयार्थं Ca.  
P. 450. l. 11. (V. 52, 11.) पारवत् A. परावरत् Ca. पारवार B.  
P. 450. l. 20. (V. 52, 12.) छंदोऽभिस्तोतारः B. Ca. छंदोभिस्तोतारः A.  
P. 450. l. 20. (V. 52, 12.) स्तोतारः A. स्तुतौ विक्षिप्ताः B.; not explained in Ca.

P. 450. l. 21. (V. 52, 12.) याम्मरुतः A. Ca. ये मरुतः B.

P. 451. l. 8. (V. 52, 13.) दर्शनीयां महतीहातो वा Ca., meant for दर्शनीया महान्तो वा.

P. 451. l. 9. (V. 52, 13.) सर्वत्र विधातारः A. सर्वस्य वि० Ca. सर्ववि० B.

P. 451. l. 10. (V. 52, 13.) अथ नमस्य रम्य तिङ् उत्तरत्वादिनिधातः । उभयत्र सांहितिको दीर्घः ॥ Ca. after स्तुहि. As रम्या has been explained as an adjective, this addition was probably a marginal gloss.

P. 451. l. 17. (V. 52, 14.) तथा चाह आ गच्छेति शेषः । ऋषेः ॥ तथा छ वाह आगच्छति ऋषेः उ० Ca. तथा चाह अभिगच्छेति शेषः । उ० A. अगच्छति ऋषेः उ० B.

P. 452. l. 2. (V. 52, 15.) यद्वा नेति संप्रत्यये । वहति देवानिति वक्ष्यमाणा स्तुतिः । तथा यथां यत्नादेवात्मरु-  
तोऽच्छ मन्यानः स्तुवन् अभिष्टुवन् इति Ca. after मनुते.

P. 452. l. 3. (V. 52, 15.) मेधाविभिः प्रेरयितृभिः A.

P. 452. l. 13. (V. 52, 16.) आख्यातयोः Ca. निधातयोः A.

P. 453. l. 18. (V. 53, 1.) सुखेषु A. मखेषु B. Ca.

P. 453. l. 18. (V. 53, 1.) पृषतीः B. पृषतः Ca. पृषतः A.

P. 454. l. 1. (V. 53, 2.) आक्रोशध्वनिं Ca.

P. 454. l. 2. (V. 53, 2.) कथा कथं यः पूर्वमिच्छति B.

P. 454. l. 4. (V. 53, 2.) वृष्यत्वादीनि added in A. after अचतरेषुः.

P. 454. l. 10. (V. 53, 3.) अनयात् A. Ca.; B. omits the whole passage.

P. 454. l. 11. (V. 53, 3.) इत्थं लपते मल्लमाहुः A. इत्थं मे मल्लं लपंतमाहुः B. इत्थं मल्लं लपंत-  
माहुः Ca.

P. 454. l. 13. (V. 53, 3.) अलेपाः A. Ca. अपापाः B.

P. 454. l. 14. (V. 53, 3.) तथा स्थितान् B. Ca. यथास्थितान् A.

P. 454. l. 25. (V. 53, 4.) धन्वसु निरुदकप्रदेशेषु B.

P. 455. l. 9. (V. 53, 5.) युष्माकं रथान् A. युष्माकं युष्मान् B. युष्मान् Ca.

P. 455. l. 9. (V. 53, 5.) मोदाय A. मदाय B. Ca.

P. 455. l. 11. (V. 53, 5.) दीप्तिः A. B. Ca.

P. 455. l. 11. (V. 53, 5.) वृष्ट्यां ॥ वृष्टयः A. B. C.

P. 456. l. 6. (V. 53, 7.) निर्भिदंतो मेघात् B. Ca. चितरंतो A.

P. 456. l. 7. (V. 53, 7.) नवप्रसूतिका A.

P. 456. l. 9. (V. 53, 7.) नद्यो विमोकाय वर्तते विविधं etc. A.

P. 456. l. 10. (V. 53, 7.) प्रतिनिवृत्त्य Ca. प्रतिवृत्त्य A.

P. 456. l. 18. (V. 53, 8.) परावतो दूरदेशे तत्र तत्र शुलोकादौ A. परावतो दू तत्र तत्र दूरदेशादौ Ca.

P. 457. l. 2. (V. 53, 9.) मा before निकृष्टं from B.

P. 457. l. 12. (V. 53, 10.) B. has only the second explanation: हे मरुतः रथानां रहणशी-  
लानां नव्यसीनां अजीर्णानां वः युष्माकं शर्षं येयामभिभावुकं त्वेषं दीप्तिं तं मारुतं गणां स्तौमि । etc.

P. 457. l. 22. (V. 53, 11.) विचक्षितं Ca. विवक्षित A. अविवक्षितगणो ब्रातः inserted by Ca.  
in the commentary of the preceding verse, instead of अथ परेक्षकृतः.

P. 459. l. 2. (V. 53, 14.) तत्सर्वं A. सर्वेण B. Ca.

P. 459. l. 12. (V. 53, 15.) एवं भवति A. एवं भवन्ति B. य एवं भवन्ति Ca.

P. 461. l. 10. (V. 54, 3.) उद्धत° B. Ca. उद्धत° A.

P. 461. l. 20. (V. 54, 4.) रजांसि लोकान् B.

P. 461. l. 20. (V. 54, 4.) From हे धृतयः to हे मरुतः left out in Ca. The same lacuna seems to have existed in the MS. from which B. was copied, because B. gives quite a different explanation: अच्चात्मागीन् व्यजय हे धृतयः कंपयितारो मरुतः यूयं ईं अस्मान् नाहं रिष्यथ न हिंसय दृष्टांतः नावः यथा आश्रितानां रक्षंति तद्वत् ॥

P. 461. l. 21. (V. 54, 4.) विव्यजय ॥ विव्यथ A.

P. 462. l. 8. (V. 54, 5.) निहतवंतः A. निहितवंतः B. Ca.

P. 462. l. 15. (V. 54, 6.) वृष्टेः A. विविधं B.

P. 462. l. 15. (V. 54, 6.) In Ca. a lacuna from वृष्टेः to वृष्टो. Again B. has peculiar readings: हे वेधसः विविधं विधाताः मरुतः यत् अर्णैः मेघं मोषय ताडयथ तत् शर्थः अभ्राजि अशोभत् etc.

P. 462. l. 15. (V. 54, 6.) गणं A. C. Mill. बलं?

P. 463. l. 14. (V. 54, 8.) तद्वन्तो मरुतः संघात्मकस्य पदार्थस्य (स्य marg.) विश्लेषयिताः नरो नराकारा नेतारो वा A. तद्वन्तो मरुतः नरो संघात्मकस्य पदार्थस्य ग्रामजितः विश्लेषयिताः नरो नकारा नेतारो वा Ca. तद्वन्तः मरुतः नरः संघात्मकस्य पदार्थस्य नेतारः ग्रामजितः विश्लेषयिताः मरुतः B.

P. 463. l. 15. (V. 54, 8.) अयं शब्दो A. नियुच्छदो Ca.

P. 463. l. 16. (V. 54, 8.) नर इव (for नरो यथा) A. Ca.; wanting in B.

P. 463. l. 17. (V. 54, 8.) दीप्ता A. दीप्तर B. Ca.

P. 463. l. 19. (V. 54, 8.) यद्वाखरन् Ca. यदाखरन् A.; wanting in B.

P. 464. l. 2. (V. 54, 9.) मरुत्साराय A. मरुत्परा B. Ca.

P. 464. l. 5. (V. 54, 9.) क्षुमतयः Ca. सुतयः A. मतयः B.

P. 464. l. 25. (V. 54, 11.) हारा ॥ आहारा A. B. C.

P. 464. l. 25. (V. 54, 11.) मधुरामुषा A. मधुरा B. Ca.

P. 465. l. 25. (V. 54, 13.) रमयंत A. B. Ca.

P. 466. l. 17. (V. 54, 15.) अभिततनाम विस्तारयाम B.

P. 467. l. 9. (V. 55, 1.) यद्वोदकं A. तद्वोदकं Ca. तद्वदेकं B.

P. 468. l. 19. (V. 55, 5.) समुद्रवर्णसाधनात् Ca. यमुद्रवर्णसाधनात् A.

P. 469. l. 4. (V. 55, 6.) सारंगीवो A. Ca.; wanting in B.

P. 469. l. 23. (V. 55, 8.) उच्चार्येते Ca. after उद्यते.

P. 470. l. 15. (V. 55, 10.) Ca. has a lacuna from वस्यो to गृणानाः, which in B. is filled up arbitrarily, as in other similar instances.

P. 472. l. 9. (V. 56, 4.) अश्वा इव after गावो न A. B. Ca.

P. 472. l. 21. (V. 56, 5.) पूर्वोहो A. पूर्वो B. Ca.

P. 474. l. 10. (V. 56, 9.) आवाहयति A. आह्वयति Ca.

P. 475. l. 1. (V. 57, 1.) उदकेच्छवे A. उदकोत्सवे B. Ca.

P. 475. l. 19. (V. 57, 3.) यदा after हे मरुतो A.

P. 475. l. 20. (V. 57, 3.) धनानि च धूनुष प्रापयथ B. धनानि चाथ Ca. धनार्थं A.

P. 475. l. 21. (V. 57, 3.) अवनता भृशं शंसंतीत्यर्थः A. अवनता भृशं वंतीत्यर्थः Ca. अवनता भृशं संतीत्यर्थः C. Mill.

P. 476. l. 8. (V. 57, 4.) सरूपाः A. सदृशाः B. Ca.

P. 476. l. 18. (V. 57, 5.) शोभनजननाः A. शोभनजाताः B. शोभनजानाः Ca.

P. 477. l. 4. (V. 57, 6.) विपरिणेतव्यः ॥ विपरिणेतव्यः A. Ca.

P. 477. l. 7. (V. 57, 6.) तथा वः तनूषु अयवेषु विष्ठा श्री सर्वा कान्तिः पिपिषे आश्रिता B. In Ca. this passage and the beginning of the next verse are given only in the margin. B. has supplied the omission independently, as in V. 55, 9.

P. 477. l. 14. (V. 57, 7.) हे मरुतः गोमत् गोयुक्तं अश्ववत् अयुक्तं रथवत् रथोपेतं सुवीरं सुष्ट पुत्रोपेतं B. अश्वरूपेतं चंद्रवत् A. and Ca. in marg.

P. 477. l. 15. (V. 57, 7.) एकवचनं ॥ बहुवचनं A. व्यतेन बहुवचनं। अथवा left out in Ca.

P. 478. l. 2. (V. 57, 8.) एतानि सर्वाणि संबोधनप्रथमांतानि पूर्वस्य पूर्वस्याविद्यमानत्वेनोदात्तानि Ca. after प्रभूतस्तुतयः.

P. 478. l. 14. (V. 58, 1.) गणावयवभूता A. गणावयवा Ca.; wanting in B.

P. 480. l. 23. (V. 58, 6.) सह मरुतो taken from Ca.

P. 482. l. 6. (V. 59, 1.) रज आ अंतरिक्ष। B. रज आ तदर्थं अंतरिक्ष A. Ca.

P. 482. l. 17. (V. 59, 2.) ज्ञायते ते ॥ ज्ञायते न A. Ca. ज्ञायते तेन B.

P. 482. l. 18. (V. 59, 2.) The explanation of अमात् is left out in A. Ca. अमात्स्वस्थानात् B. after हविर्भक्षणाय.

P. 482. l. 26. (V. 59, 3.) वृष्टेर्वि A. दृष्टेर्वि Ca. दृष्टे वि B.

P. 483. l. 11. (V. 59, 3.) स्तोत्राणि क उदश्ववत् A. B. Ca.

P. 483. l. 21. (V. 59, 5.) From सवंधवः to स्नेहयुक्ता left out in B. and Ca.

P. 484. l. 21. (V. 59, 7.) भनतेः ॥ नभतेः A. Ca. See Nighaṇṭu III. 14. and Dhātupāṭha, s.v.

P. 485. l. 7. (V. 59, 8.) अदितिर्भूमिश्च मिमातु from Ca.

P. 486. l. 7. (V. 60, 2.) प्रसिद्धासु वा Ca. after आंतासु.

P. 486. l. 20. (V. 60, 3.) सानु समुच्छ्रितः प्रदेशो रेजत। कंपते। B. सानु समुन्नितः प्रदेशः रेजसे कंपसे कंपते Ca. सानु समुच्छ्रितप्रदेशं रेजथ कंपयथ A.

P. 487. l. 8. (V. 60, 4.) महांसि तेजांसि B., taken from the following explanation.

P. 487. l. 25. (V. 60, 6.) हे अग्ने added by B., before हे मरुतः.

P. 487. l. 25. (V. 60, 6.) यूयं उत उल्कृष्टे उत्तमे चरमे दिवि A. यूयं उत उल्कृष्टे उत्तमे चरमे दिवि Ca. यूयं उत्तमे उल्कृष्टे दिवि B.

P. 488. l. 3. (V. 60, 6.) विज्ञाद्वि Ca.; the rest, which ought to follow on the next page, being left out. विज्ञात् वेत्य B. विज्ञात् विद्वि जानीहीति शेषः। Aa.

P. 488. l. 24. (V. 60, 8.) आयुभिरायुष्मद्भिः from B.

P. 489. l. 2. (V. 61, 1.) दार्भ्यं Anukramanī.

P. 489. l. 11. (V. 61, 1.) सुतां A. नृपं B. Ca.

P. 489. l. 12. (V. 61, 1.) प्रदास्यसि A. प्रदाम्यहं B. Ca.

P. 489. l. 23. (V. 61, 1.) मुदितात्मविद्भिः B. Ca. by the same mistake.

P. 489. l. 24. (V. 61, 1.) पश्चात्पुनर्गृहं गत्वा भूयो लभ्या गवां शतं। ततो A. पुरुमील्लगृहं पश्चात् गत्वा पश्चात्पुनर्गृहं। गत्वा भूयो लभ्या गवां शतं दास्यो Ca. पुरुमील्लगृहं पश्चात् गत्वा पश्चात्पुनर्गृहं गत्वा भूयो लभ्यं गवां शतं दार्भ्यो B.



P. 489. l. 24. (V. 61, 1.) चाच्याचोदितः A. चाज्ञावोदितः Ca. चारूचोदितः B. राज्या by conjecture.

P. 490. l. 16. (V. 61, 3.) ताडयन्वर्तत इत्यर्थः by conjecture. ताडयन्वर्तत इत्यर्थः Ca. ताडयन्वत इत्यर्थः A.

P. 490. l. 17. (V. 61, 3.) वि विविच्य ॥ विवेच्य Ca. विविच्य A. वियमुः नियच्छंति B.

P. 490. l. 21. (V. 61, 4.) इतन Pada MS. P. 1. 2. रतन Sanhitā MS. S. 1. 2. 3.

P. 490. l. 25. (V. 61, 4.) रुद्रपुत्रा B. Ca. रुद्रपतिका A.

P. 490. l. 25. (V. 61, 4.) ताम्रादयो यथा दीप्ताः from A.

P. 490. l. 26. (V. 61, 4.) The explanation of परा रतन (इतन the Pada MSS.) is left out in A. Ca. अग्नितापःऽग्निना तप्ताः यथा अस्य तद्वत् परा तेन प्रदीप्ता भवथः । B.

P. 491. l. 15. (V. 61, 6.) हे आत्मन् B. after अपि च.

P. 491. l. 15. (V. 61, 6.) यद्वा उतेत्यमेवकारार्थे । स्त्रीषु सैव A. यद्वा उतो वेत्येवमेवकारार्थे स्त्रीषु सैव Ca.; not in B.

P. 491. l. 18. (V. 61, 6.) देव येन त्वायते सुत्यादिना स देवतः । A. sec. man. देवत्वान्येन त्वायते etc. A. pr. man. and Ca. A sentence is left out, which should be तद्विपरिती or तदन्योऽदेवतः । B. reads देवाः न त्वायते सुत्यादीनायं (for सुत्यादिना येन) स अदेवतः ।

P. 491. l. 24. (V. 61, 7.) तथा नृष्यंतं विजानाति is left out in Ca., therefore B. has a peculiar explanation : नृष्यंतं पिपासितं विजानाति.

P. 492. l. 18. (V. 61, 9.) विप्राय, left out in A. Ca., is inserted in B. after प्रभूतगृहाय.

P. 492. l. 20. (V. 61, 9.) वियेमतुः । विशेषेण पमयतुः etc. A.

P. 493. l. 2. (V. 61, 10.) तं सुवे B. सुवत A. Ca.

P. 493. l. 7. (V. 61, 11.) जनप्रसिद्धैः ॥ जनीप्रसिद्धैः A. प्रसिद्धैः Ca.

P. 494. l. 23. (V. 61, 17.) The introductory verses are wanting in B.

P. 494. l. 23. (V. 61, 17.) After रथवी-, at the beginning of the third Śloka, three leaves are wanting in Ca., which are supplied by others, written by a modern hand. The omission goes as far as अद्या व्याप- in V. 62, 7. These leaves are copied from an A. MS., which can be proved partly by the absence in this part of all various readings in A. and Ca., partly by the same mistakes occurring in both; e. g. 62, 6. भवथेति A. Ca. भवथ इति B. अनकेकावष्टभक°, हिरण्यरूपं etc.

P. 495. l. 5. (V. 61, 17.) भगवन् A. C. भगवान् A. Ca.

P. 496. l. 17. (V. 62, 1.) मत्वर्थ° ॥ अन्वर्थ° A. Ca.: cf. Rv. I. 118, 5.

P. 496. l. 18. (V. 62, 1.) श्रेष्ठं रक्तं मुख्यं प्रशस्यं B.

P. 497. l. 5. (V. 62, 2.) आवर्तनायोगात् ॥ आवर्तमानायोगात् A. Ca.

P. 497. l. 12. (V. 62, 3.) ययोः सकाशात् A. Ca. याभ्यां तौ B.

P. 498. l. 12. (V. 62, 5.) आसन्नवलौ A. Ca. आयसन्नवलौ B.

P. 498. l. 26. (V. 62, 6.) अनेकावष्टभकस्तंभोपेत सौ° A. Ca. अनेकस्यंभोपेतं सौ B.

P. 499. l. 9. (V. 62, 7.) अयोविकारा A. Ca. हिरण्यविकारा B.

P. 499. l. 11. (V. 62, 7.) विद्युत् सा च दिविभाजते A. विद्युत् सा च दिवि भाजते Ca. विद्युत् तद्वत् B.

P. 499. l. 12. (V. 62, 7.) तिल्लिले वा । वाशब्द इत्यर्थे । Ca.

P. 499. l. 14. (V. 62, 7.) निर्मिता स्थूणे यूपयष्टिरवस्थितः । Ca. निर्मिता स्थूणे यूपयष्टिरवस्थितः । A. निर्मित्ताययष्टिः अवस्थितः B. स्थूणे might be a dual.

P. 499. l. 15. (V. 62, 7.) Instead of अधिगर्तस्य, Sáyana explains अधि गर्तस्य; B. only has गर्तस्य गर्तः.

P. 499. l. 25. (V. 62, 8.) प्रजादिका B. प्राजादिकां Ca. प्राज्ञादिकां A.

P. 501. l. 6. (V. 63, 1.) चतस्रोदकस्य गोपौ A. चतस्य यज्ञस्योदकस्य गोपौ Ca. चतस्य गोपौ यज्ञस्य रक्षितारौ B.

P. 502. l. 12. (V. 63, 4.) From उच्यते to -मंतो द्रष्टा left out in A. and Aa. The Mill MS. has no omission, which shows that in this part it was not copied directly from A. Colebrooke. That it is, however, a copy from an A. MS. is indicated by the fact that it has, like A., शत्रुमारकत्वात्, while B. Ca. read शत्रूणां मारकत्वात्.

P. 502. l. 14. (V. 63, 4.) त्वत्सृष्टौ आगच्छन्ति B.

P. 502. l. 20. (V. 63, 5.) उदकार्थं A. शुभकार्थं B. Ca.

P. 502. l. 20. (V. 63, 5.) शोभनाक्षद्वारं A. शोभनाक्षं B. Ca.

P. 502. l. 23. (V. 63, 5.) तन्वयः वर्षयितारः ततस्ते मरुतो B. तन्वयस्ततस्ते मरुतो Ca.

P. 503. l. 16. (V. 63, 7.) A. has हे मित्रावरुणा युवां धर्मेणा जगद्धारकेण विपश्चिता स्तुतेनेत्यर्थः । व्रता व्रतेन कर्मेणा । अथवा विपश्चिता । स्तोत्रनामैतत् । यजमानेन वृद्ध्या जगद्धारणस्य यजमानोऽपि कारणं । तत्कृतयाङ्गुत्ता वृद्ध्युत्पत्तेः । व्रता व्रतेन युवयोः कर्मेणा असुरस्य । B. Ca. agree in हे मित्रावरुणा (मित्रावरुणौ added in B.) विपश्चिता प्राज्ञौ युवां धर्मेणा जगद्धारकेण वृद्ध्यादिलक्षणेन कर्मेणा व्रता (व्रतेन Ca.) यज्ञादिकर्माणि रक्षेये पालयथः । असुरस्य etc.

P. 503. l. 17. (V. 63, 7.) यज्ञादिकर्माणि रक्षेये । पालयथः । added from B. Ca. After वृद्ध्युत्पत्तेः, A. repeats व्रता व्रतेन युवयोः कर्मेणा.

P. 503. l. 19. (V. 63, 7.) रक्षेये इत्यर्थः A. विदीपय इत्यर्थः Ca. दीपयथः B.

P. 504. l. 8. (V. 64, 1.) अथायुवतोच्यते A. अथावयुवतोच्यते Ca.; not in B. We might expect अथ संयुज्योच्यते.

P. 505. l. 14. (V. 64, 4.) B. and Ca. have स्पर्धमानाय instead of स्पर्धनाय A.

P. 506. l. 2. (V. 64, 6.) Both Padas read वरुणा; the Sanhitás वरुण; Sáyana वरुणा. The same occurs V. 66, 6, where मित्र in the Sanhitá; मित्रा in the Pada.

P. 506. l. 16. (V. 64, 7.) यज्ञे B. Ca. गृहे A. The explanation of क्षत by यज्ञ is very common.

P. 506. l. 19. (V. 64, 7.) अर्चनानसं विभ्रतौ अर्चनानसं अग्निं धारयंतौ युवां B. at the end.

P. 507. l. 3. (V. 65, 1.) य स्तोता चिकेत जानाति स्तुतिं A. यस्तनोति स्तुतिं Ca. यस्तनोति स्तुतिं B.

P. 507. l. 4. (V. 65, 1.) देवता देवेषु स्तोत्रमध्ये ॥ यद्वा देवेषु मध्ये A. देवता देवेषु मध्ये Ca. B.

P. 507. l. 5. (V. 65, 1.) यस्य ॥ यश्च A. B. Ca.

P. 507. l. 7. (V. 65, 1.) संभजते A. स लभते B. Ca.

P. 508. l. 6. (V. 65, 4.) अंहस्ततोऽपि A. Ca. अंहसः पापिनोऽपि B.

P. 508. l. 7. (V. 65, 4.) हि is explained twice in A. B. Ca., only मित्रस्य हि is left out in Ca.

P. 509. l. 15. (V. 66, 1.) रातहव्ये त्वमिति तस्यैवं A. रातहव्यस्यैव Ca.

- P. 509. l. 16. (V. 66, 1.) आ आकार्य A. आहयाकार्य Ca. आह्य B.  
P. 509. l. 18. (V. 66, 1.) वरुणाय from B.  
P. 509. l. 26. (V. 66, 2.) असुरविधातिमत् हंतुमित्यर्थः । A. असुरविधातिमहन् हे Ca.  
P. 510. l. 11. (V. 66, 3.) संबंधिभिः B. संबंधिनः A. Ca.  
P. 511. l. 3. (V. 66, 5.) जयतेरपि भवति from Ca.  
P. 511. l. 26. (V. 67, 1.) यद्वा यजतं मामूर्ध्वं क्षत्रमाशाये । अंतर्णीतित्यर्थः । आशयतं । व्यापयतमित्यर्थः । Ca.  
after बहुवचनीकर्तव्यं.  
P. 512. l. 22. (V. 67, 4.) उदकस्य कर्तारः B. Ca. उदकस्यृशत्वस्य कर्तारः A.  
P. 513. l. 4. (V. 67, 4.) The MSS. of the Pada have मित्र, not मित्रा.  
P. 513. l. 6. (V. 67, 5.) सर्वैः स्तूयमानः A. सर्वैः स्तुतः B. Ca.  
P. 514. l. 7. (V. 68, 2.) स्तुत्या गायत B. Ca.  
P. 514. l. 18. (V. 68, 4.) हविर्वा B. Ca. वहिर्वा A.  
P. 514. l. 24. (V. 68, 5.) वृष्यर्था A. वर्षा B. Ca.  
P. 515. l. 2. (V. 68, 5.) दानुमत्या दानवत्या दातृभूचिताया ॥ दानुमत्याः दानवत्याः दानमुचिताया A. दानु-  
मत्याः । दातृभूचिताया । B. दानुमत्याः दानमत्याः ॥ दातृषु चिताया । Ca.  
P. 515. l. 18. (V. 69, 1.) अचिरतं A. अचिरंतनं असंततं Ca.  
P. 515. l. 24. (V. 69, 2.) इरावतीः इरां क्षीरलक्षणां तद्वत्त्वं A. Ca. इरावती क्षीरत्वः B.  
P. 515. l. 25. (V. 69, 2.) From तथा सिंधवः to तथा त्रयः left out in Ca. तथा वां सिंधवः नद्यः  
मधुमत् रसं दुदुहे दुहंति B.  
P. 516. l. 2. (V. 69, 2.) पृथिव्यंतरिक्षद्युलोकानां from B. Ca.  
P. 516. l. 20. (V. 69, 4.) पार्थिवस्य रजसो या यौ A. Ca. पार्थिवस्य भूलोकस्य B.  
P. 517. l. 8. (V. 70, 1.) पुरोरपि बहु उरु बहुतरं A. Ca.; wanting in B. We should  
expect पुरुषोऽपि बहुनोऽप्युरु बहुतरं.  
P. 517. l. 17. (V. 70, 2.) रुद्रिः ॥ रुद्रिः A. रुचद्रिः Ca.  
P. 517. l. 23. (V. 70, 3.) शोभनेन त्रायनेन A. शोभनेन Ca. शोभनपालकौ B.  
P. 518. l. 6. (V. 70, 4.) समृद्धा वयं अन्यथा [वयं कस्य] चित् धनेन शरीरपोषं न कुर्म इत्यर्थः । तथा शेष  
अतृचालकं etc. B. has समृद्धा वयं तथा शेषसा अन्यथा चित् धनेन मा शरीरपोषं न कुर्म तथा तनसा  
अन्यात्मकेन धने शरीरपोषं मा न कुर्मः । समृद्धा वयं अन्यथा चित् धनेन शरीरपोषं न कुर्म इत्यर्थः तथा शेषसा  
अपलेन सहिता मा भुजेम A.  
P. 518. l. 17. (V. 71, 1.) चरणीयं A. रमणीयं B. Ca.  
P. 518. l. 19. (V. 71, 1.) निबर्हणौ हंतायै शत्रूणां from Ca. बहर्णा हंतायै शत्रूणां B.  
P. 518. l. 25. (V. 71, 2.) फलैः from B. Ca.  
P. 519. l. 16. (V. 72, 1.) गतयोः after मित्रावरुणयोः Ca. in margine.  
P. 521. l. 16. (V. 73, 3.) तेजोवत् A. तेजस्तत् B. Ca. : cf. Pāṇ. I. 4, 18, 2.  
P. 521. l. 16. (V. 73, 3.) चक्रं after तेजोवत् repeated in A. B. Ca.  
P. 521. l. 18. (V. 73, 3.) प्रातरादिसवनात् A., and Ca. sec. man. °सवनानि B., and Ca.  
pr. man.  
P. 522. l. 2. (V. 73, 4.) पौरिण मा सु etc. A.  
P. 522. l. 4. (V. 73, 4.) गमयथः । गमयथुः A. Ca. रयमथुः B.

- P. 522. l. 22. (V. 73, 6.) अत्रिरस्मत्पिता चृषिः B. Ca. before सति ॥
- P. 522. l. 22. (V. 73, 6.) उच्यते Aa. उच्यते A. उच्यत B. Ca.
- P. 522. l. 24. (V. 73, 6.) दहंतमग्निम° B. Ca. दहंत असु° A.
- P. 524. l. 10. (V. 73, 10.) रथानिव शिल्पी तद्वत्तक्ष्मे तानि संतु A. रथानिव शिल्पी तद्वत् तक्षाम Ca.
- by corrections. रथान् इव शिल्पी तानि शंतमा सुखतमानि संतुष्टा B.
- P. 524. l. 22. (V. 74, 1.) कौ भूमौ left out in A. कूस्थौ कौ भूमौ C. Mill.
- P. 524. l. 22. (V. 74, 1.) शृणुषुः from B. Ca. and C. Mill.
- P. 524. l. 24. (V. 74, 1.) अथवा deest in A. and C. Mill.
- P. 525. l. 6. (V. 74, 2.) तिष्ठतः ॥ तिष्ठथः A. B. Ca.
- P. 525. l. 15. (V. 74, 3.) उल्लंघ्य याथः Ca. C. Mill. उल्लंघयथः A.
- P. 526. l. 3. (V. 74, 4.) प्रेरयथः B. C. Ca.; not in A.
- P. 526. l. 3. (V. 74, 4.) ईमिति पूरणः A. Ca. हि पूरणः B.
- P. 526. l. 4. (V. 74, 4.) गृभीतताये गृहीतताये Ca. (for °तातये).
- P. 526. l. 5. (V. 74, 4.) प्रचलं सिंहं B. C. Ca.; omitted in A.
- P. 526. l. 14. (V. 74, 5.) तदा B. Ca. तथा A.
- P. 526. l. 15. (V. 74, 5.) काममा कमनीयं रूपमृषे A.
- P. 526. l. 22. (V. 74, 6.) वां इह संदर्शने B.
- P. 527. l. 7. (V. 74, 7.) From सर्वतो to को यजमानो from A.; कः अवत्रे वत्रे कः यजमानः यज्ञैः युवां वत्रे विप्रवाहसा विप्रस्य यजमानस्य अभिमतप्रापयितारौ युवां कः विप्रः वत्रे B.
- P. 527. l. 7. (V. 74, 7.) वहनीयौ by conjecture. वहनी A.
- P. 527. l. 8. (V. 74, 7.) वद्वे । यो यजमानो यज्ञैर्वद्वे अत्यंत° etc.
- P. 528. l. 1. (V. 74, 9.) मधुमंतौ सोमकामौ वा Ca.
- P. 528. l. 4. (V. 74, 9.) अभीशुभिः । ; cf. Rv. I. 104, 1. अभिशुभिर्दीयतं A.; deest in B. Ca.
- P. 528. l. 10. (V. 74, 10.) तत्र A. कुतचित्तत्वापि B. Ca.
- P. 529. l. 10. (V. 75, 2.) यथा before अहं from B. Ca.
- P. 529. l. 23. (V. 75, 3.) वाजिनधनौ A. Ca. अन्नधनौ B.
- P. 530. l. 6. (V. 75, 4.) हे वृषणवसू to वसूनां from Ca. हे वृषणवसू वर्षधनौ B.; left out in A.
- P. 530. l. 8. (V. 75, 4.) मृगो मृगयिता ययिर्गता B. Ca. मृगो मृगयिता left out in A.
- P. 530. l. 18. (V. 75, 5.) मायारहितं from B. Ca.
- P. 530. l. 18. (V. 75, 5.) पथि Ca. पंथि B. नयि A.
- P. 531. l. 19. (V. 75, 8.) अस्मिन्वत्त्रे from B.
- P. 531. l. 20. (V. 75, 8.) उपप्राप्तुतं A. प्राप्तुतं B. Ca. Ca. has at the end भू प्राप्नोति इति धातुः । यद्वा अवस्योः समीपे भवतं ।.
- P. 532. l. 1. (V. 75, 9.) अग्निराहवनीयः चृत्विः चृत्तौ काले भव B. Ca. after अभीयत.
- P. 532. l. 1. (V. 75, 9.) प्रकाशितहविरित्यर्थः । A. Ca. Cf. सुचक्षूः Böetlingk, सुज्योतिः Benfey. चित्तशोचिः Rv. VI. 10, 3; but भद्रशोचे Rv. X. 45, 9.
- P. 532. l. 23. (V. 76, 1.) From स्वांगैः to वसतीवरिभिः taken from Ca. कं प्रति । पीपिवांसं आपायितं घर्मे क्षरद्रूपं etc. A. कं प्रति । पीपिवांसं स्वांगैः परिवृढं घर्मे प्रदीप्तयज्ञं B.

- P. 533. l. 6. (V. 76, 2.) हिंस्तां ॥ हिंस्तं A. Ca. B.
- P. 533. l. 7. (V. 76, 2.) गंतुतमौ युवां A. गंतुतमौ अश्वि° Ca. B.
- P. 533. l. 8. (V. 76, 2.) अन्नेन च after रख्येन B. Ca.
- P. 533. l. 8. (V. 76, 2.) आगंतुतमौ अवर्तिं प्रति A. आगंतुतमौ नाशयंताविति शेषः अथवा अवर्तिं प्रति Ca. आगंतुतमौ नाशयंताविति शेषः । प्रति द्वंद्विभू आगत्य वस्त्रं अजीवनं दारिद्र्यं नाशयित्वा दाशुषे etc. B.
- P. 533. l. 11. (V. 76, 2.) भवतां । deest in A. B.
- P. 533. l. 17. (V. 76, 3.) तमाना A. तमाना Ca. after पंचदशधा.
- P. 533. l. 23. (V. 76, 3.) किं तर्हि B. Ca. तेत्यावाहावा । A.
- P. 533. l. 25. (V. 76, 3.) इतरदेवानां सोमस्य घर्मस्य वा पानं Ca. इतरदेवानां सोमस्य पानं B. इतरदेवानां पानं A.
- P. 533. l. 25. (V. 76, 3.) नाततान न तनोति A. ततान तनोति Ca. आततान तनोति अश्विनर अश्विनौ न विहायेति शेषः । तस्मादागच्छतं B.
- P. 534. l. 9. (V. 76, 4.) अयां ॥ अयः A. B. Ca.
- P. 535. l. 19. (V. 77, 2.) देवगामि नो A. देवगामि B. Ca.
- P. 535. l. 23. (V. 77, 2.) देवानां संभजनीय संभाव्यो A. देवानाभोजेति B. Ca.
- P. 536. l. 19. (V. 77, 4.) कर्म विषेय A. कर्मविशेषं B. Ca.
- P. 536. l. 20. (V. 77, 4.) पालयेत् ॥ पालयत् A. B. Ca.
- P. 537. l. 4. (V. 78, 1.) The Anukramanī has besides, संयाः पंच गर्भसाविष्य उपनिषत्.
- P. 537. l. 7. (V. 78, 1.) The second Viniyoga is left out in Ca.
- P. 537. l. 17. (V. 78, 1.) तौ यथा after इव by conjecture.
- P. 537. l. 24. (V. 78, 2.) यवसं घासं Ca. B. यवसे घासाय A.
- P. 538. l. 17. (V. 78, 4.) रथेन तं रक्षितुं B. Ca.; not in A. Ca. adds जवता before शंतमेन.
- P. 538. l. 20. (V. 78, 5.) अत्राद्भवंति A. अत्र द्रुवंति B. Ca.
- P. 538. l. 20. (V. 78, 5.) प्रक्षिप्य B. Ca. प्रक्षेप्य A.
- P. 538. l. 22. (V. 78, 5.) निर्ममिष्यंति A. निर्मिमिष्यंति Ca. समुद्वाग्निर्मिमिष्यति B. निर्मिमिष्यंति MS. of the Nītimanjari.
- P. 538. l. 23. (V. 78, 5.) कृशः B. Ca. शिशुः A.
- P. 538. l. 26. (V. 78, 5.) रमयित्वा A. रमित्वाय B. Ca.
- P. 539. l. 7. (V. 78, 5.) प्रसवोद्भूत्याः A. प्रसोप्यमाणायाः B. Ca.
- P. 539. l. 7. (V. 78, 5.) ब्रू प्रणिप्रसवे लटि शतरि रूपं संज्ञापूर्वस्य विधेरनित्यत्वात् गुणाभावः Ca. after योनिरिव.
- P. 539. l. 16. (V. 78, 6.) The commentary is given according to A. B., with the exception that मम निर्गमार्थे appears only in B. Ca. has after सं चाचयः the words प्रविष्टे मयि निर्गते चाप्रविष्टशंकापनोदनार्थे व्यचयश्च विगमयतं मम निर्गमार्थे etc. The same addition is found in the margin of A. by a later hand. C. Mill does not contain it.
- P. 540. l. 8. (V. 78, 8.) यथा स्वयं समुद्रः तरंगैः कंपति एव एवं त्वं हे दशमास्य etc. B.
- P. 540. l. 10. (V. 78, 8.) जरयुजः ॥ जरयुक्तः A. जरयुक्तः Ca.
- P. 541. l. 5. (V. 79, 1.) अबोधयः प्रज्ञापयः B. Ca.
- P. 542. l. 21. (V. 79, 5.) फलं ॥ बलं A.

- P. 543. l. 3. (V. 79, 6.) स्तोत्रेषु left out in Ca. सूरिषु प्रजावत्सु B.
- P. 544. l. 3. (V. 79, 9.) विभातं A. विवासं Ca. तनोविवासं B.
- P. 544. l. 11. (V. 79, 10.) क्रमेतावत् हे यदित् एतावदेव A.
- P. 545. l. 1. (V. 80, 1.) च्छतावरी सत्यवती B.
- P. 546. l. 3. (V. 80, 4.) च्येनी भवति । विशेषेण श्वेता भवति A. च्येनी भवति Ca., with श्वेता भवति in marg. च्येनी प्रकाशवती भवति B.
- P. 546. l. 3. (V. 80, 4.) After प्रथममध्यमयोः we should expect स्थानयोः, as Rv. I. 71, 6. 114, 10.
- P. 546. l. 5. (V. 80, 4.) पंचानं मेरोः प्रांतदेशं अनुक्रमेण B. Ca. omits all from दिशि to निनाति.
- P. 546. l. 7. (V. 80, 4.) अथगच्छंती च Ca. A.
- P. 546. l. 25. (V. 80, 6.) प्रेरयति विवृणोति Ca.
- P. 548. l. 18. (V. 81, 3.) शुभः शोभमानः सन् A. B. Ca.
- P. 550. l. 10. (V. 82, 2.) असुरादयो ॥ सुरादयो A. B. Ca.
- P. 550. l. 23. (V. 82, 4.) प्रजापशुगृहादिकं stood probably in the margin of the original Codex. A. inserts it after प्रेरय, while B. Ca. have it in the right place in the following verse.
- P. 551. l. 20. (V. 82, 7.) तं हि ॥ स हि A. Ca.
- P. 551. l. 20. (V. 82, 7.) सर्वात्मत्वात् A. सर्वात्मकत्वात् Ca.
- P. 553. l. 1. (V. 83, 1.) जरयिता A. Ca.
- P. 553. l. 10. (V. 83, 2.) A. Ca. begin with पर्जन्यस्तुपेराद्यंतविपरीतस्य. B. has अनागाः निष्पापः पर्जन्यः वृष्टान् इति etc.
- P. 555. l. 2. (V. 83, 6.) अर्वाङ् B. अर्वाङ् A. Ca.
- P. 556. l. 16. (V. 83, 10.) जलप्रदेशान् in A. before धन्वति.
- P. 556. l. 17. (V. 83, 10.) जलवतः कृतवानसि B. Ca.; not in A.
- P. 556. l. 25. (V. 84, 1.) भूमिस्तोमे चैषा ॥ स्तोमे तेषा A. Ca.
- P. 557. l. 18. (V. 84, 2.) उद्धृतं A. उद्धृतं Ca.
- P. 558. l. 3. (V. 84, 3.) यद्यस्याः ॥ यत् अस्याः A. यत् यस्यात् B. Ca.
- P. 558. l. 5. (V. 84, 3.) दिवो नीचैरंतरि° A.
- P. 558. l. 7. (V. 84, 3.) At the end of the 29th Varga the Sanhitās give a Khila :
- वर्षेतु ते विभावरी दिवो अभस् विद्युतः ।  
रोहेतु सर्व्वीजान्यव ब्रह्मद्विषो जहि ॥
- P. 558. l. 15. (V. 85, 1.) हे अत्रे B. Ca. हे अत्र A. (क्षेत्र?)
- P. 558. l. 20. (V. 85, 1.) द्वितीयस्या तृतीयस्यां Ca.
- P. 559. l. 3. (V. 85, 2.) A very similar but not identical passage is to be found in the Śatapatha-Br. III. 3, 1, 7. (p. 253.)
- P. 559. l. 16. (V. 85, 3.) तद्धीयते ॥ तद्धीयते B. तद्धीयते A. Ca. Cf. Yāska.
- P. 559. l. 21. (V. 85, 3.) प्रसारयति A. Ca. B.
- P. 560. l. 6. (V. 85, 4.) समाच्छादयन्ति A. Ca. B.

P. 561. l. 3. (V. 85, 6.) बह्व्यो नद्यः only in A.

P. 561. l. 5. (V. 85, 6.) एवोचितं न वरुणस्येति न वाच्यं तस्य वरुणादिरूपेणावस्थानात् Ca. एवोदितं न  
।दिरूपावस्थानात् A.

P. 561. l. 13. (V. 85, 7.) ईरिणान्मननाच्च शास्ती A. इरिणान्मनना प्रशास्ती° Ca.

P. 561. l. 16. (V. 85, 7.) अशब्दं ॥ अशब्दं A. अशब्दं Ca. B.

P. 561. l. 24. (V. 85, 8.) द्यूते यथा यद्विरिपुः B. A. द्यूते यथा अद्विरिपुः Ca. pr. man. द्यूते यद्विरि-  
रिपुः Ca. sec. man.

P. 561. l. 24. (V. 85, 8.) यदस्मासु ॥ तस्मासु Ca. pr. man. तथास्मासु Ca. sec. man. A.;  
deest in B.

P. 562. l. 24. (V. 86, 2.) वा by conjecture.

P. 563. l. 10. (V. 86, 3.) प्रतीयते । प्रतिगच्छतः ॥ प्रतिगच्छतः B. प्रतियते प्रतिगच्छति Ca. भवति ईषते  
अभिगच्छति A.

P. 564. l. 2. (V. 86, 5.) मतेव मनुष्याविव तौ etc. A. मतीय मनुष्याविव तौ Ca.; B. omits all.  
It seems that Sáyana took मतीय for मतेव, misled perhaps by the following अंशेव.

P. 564. l. 15. (V. 86, 6.) रयिं धनं च Ca. B.; deest in A. It ought to be रयिं धनं  
गृणतु सुवतु ।

P. 565. l. 1. (V. 87, 1.) वाचि नि° ॥ वाजिनि° A. Ca. वाच नि B.

P. 565. l. 2. (V. 87, 1.) विष्णवे व्यात्रयेन्द्राय विष्णवे वा A. विष्णवे वा Ca.

P. 565. l. 18. (V. 87, 2.) स्तौति from B. Ca. After स्तौति, Ca. has वाक्यादिवादनघातः ।

P. 565. l. 23. (V. 87, 2.) वो यूयं प्रबलाः A. शवो यूयं प्रबलाः Ca. ये च यूयं B.

P. 566. l. 8. (V. 87, 3.) तान् शृण्वरे repeated in A. Ca. after स्तुतवान्. Perhaps in-  
tended for तं शृण्वरे.

P. 566. l. 9. (V. 87, 3.) The explanation of इरी is omitted in A. नेष्ट आ । नेष्टे च  
चाल° A. Ca. has निवासे तिष्ठतां इरी ईरिता प्रेरिता नेष्टे आ नेष्टे भवति च चाल°; B. निवासे तिष्ठतां  
इरीता प्रेरिता नेष्टे अनीश्वरो कश्चन भवति चाल°. इरी does not occur again in the Rig-veda.

P. 569. l. 12. At the end of the 5th Maṇḍala, S. 1. 2. and Colebr., where however  
the leaf containing it is bound after the 6th Adhyāya, and no accents marked,  
give the following Pariśiṣṭa :

हिरण्यवर्णी हिरिणी सुवर्णीरजतसर्जा ।

चंद्रां हिरण्यं लक्ष्मीं जातवेदो ममा वह ॥ १ ॥

तां म आ वह जातवेदो लक्ष्मीमलपगामिनीं ।

यस्यां हिरण्यं विदियं गामश्च पुरुषानहं ॥ २ ॥

अश्वपूर्णा रथमध्यां हस्तिनादप्रमोदिनीं ।

अयं देवीमुप ह्ये श्रीर्मा देवीन्निषतां ॥ ३ ॥

कांसोस्मितां हिरण्यप्राकारमाद्रीं<sup>a</sup> ज्वलंतीं तृप्तां तपयंतीं ।

यन्नेस्थितां पद्मवर्णीं तामिहोप ह्ये अयं ॥ ४ ॥

चंद्रां प्रभासां यशसा जलंती श्रियं लोके देवजुष्टामुदारां ।  
तां यमनेमिं शरणं<sup>b</sup> प्र पश्ये अलक्ष्मीं नश्यतां त्वां वृणोमि ॥ ५ ॥ १ ॥  
आदित्यवर्णं तपसोऽधि जातो वनस्पतिस्तव वृक्षोऽथ वित्तः ।  
तस्य फलानि तपसा नुदंतु माया अंतर्पायाश्च<sup>c</sup> बाह्या अलक्ष्मीः ॥ ६ ॥  
उपैतु मां देवसखः कीर्त्तिश्च मणिना सह ।  
प्रादुर्भूतोऽसि<sup>d</sup> राष्ट्रेऽस्मिन्कीर्त्तिं वृद्धिं ददातु मे ॥ ७ ॥  
क्षुत्पिपासामला ज्येष्ठा अलक्ष्मीनीश्याम्यहं ।  
अभूतिमसंमृद्धिं च सर्वा निर्गुद मे गृहात् ॥ ८ ॥  
गंधद्वारां दुराधर्षा नित्यपुष्टां करिष्येति ।  
ईश्वरी सर्वभूतानां तामिहोप ह्वये श्रियं ॥ ९ ॥  
मनसः काममाकूतिं वाचः सत्यमशीमहि ।  
पशूनां रूपमन्यस्य<sup>e</sup> मयि श्रीः श्रयतां यशः ॥ १० ॥ २ ॥  
कदैमेन प्रजा भूता मयि संभ्रम कदैम ।  
श्रियं वासय मे कुले<sup>f</sup> मातरं यममालिनी ॥ ११ ॥  
आपसजंतु<sup>g</sup> स्निग्धानि चिह्नानि वस मे गृहे ।  
नी च<sup>h</sup> देवी मातरं श्रियं वासय मे कुले ॥ १२ ॥  
आर्द्रा पुष्करिणी पुष्टी<sup>i</sup> सुवर्णा हेममालिनी<sup>k</sup> ।  
सूयो हिरण्यमयी लक्ष्मी जातवेदो ममा वह ॥ १३ ॥  
आर्द्रा पुष्करिणी<sup>l</sup> यष्टी<sup>m</sup> पिङ्गला यममालिनी ।  
चंद्रां हिरण्यमयी लक्ष्मी जातवेदो ममा वह ॥ १४ ॥  
तां म आ वह जातवेदो लक्ष्मीमलपगामिनीं<sup>n</sup> ।  
यस्यां हिरण्यं प्रभूतिं<sup>o</sup> गावो दास्योऽश्वांश्चिद्वेद्यं पुरुषानहं ॥ १५ ॥  
यः शुचिः प्रयतो भूत्वा जुहुयादाज्यमन्वहं ।  
श्रियः पंचदशर्चं च श्रीकामः सततं जपेत् ॥ १६ ॥ ३ ॥  
यसानने पन्न उरु<sup>p</sup> पन्नाक्षी पन्नसंभवे ।  
तन्मे भजसि पन्नाक्षि येन सौख्यं लभाम्यहं ॥ १७ ॥ १ ॥  
अश्वदायी<sup>r</sup> गोदायी धनदायी महाधने ।  
धनं मे जुषतां देवी<sup>s</sup> सर्वकामांश्च देहि मे ॥ १८ ॥

<sup>b</sup> शरणमहं प्र S. 2. 3.

<sup>c</sup> मायांतरा S. 2. 3.

<sup>d</sup> भूतो सु S. 2. <sup>e</sup> भूतोऽस्तु S. 3.

<sup>e</sup> रूपमन्यस्य S. 3.

<sup>f</sup> गृहे S. 1.

<sup>g</sup> जंति S. 1.

<sup>h</sup> आपः सजंतु S. 3.

<sup>i</sup> नि च S. 1. 3.

<sup>j</sup> पुष्टिं S. 3.

<sup>k</sup> पिङ्गला यममालिनी S. 1.

<sup>l</sup> यः करिणी S. 2. 3.

<sup>m</sup> यष्टिं S. 3.

<sup>n</sup> नय S. 3.

<sup>o</sup> प्रभूतं S. 2.

<sup>p</sup> जरु S. 3.

<sup>q</sup> This verse is left out in S. 1.

<sup>r</sup> दायै three times, S. 2.

<sup>s</sup> देवि S. 3.



पुत्रपौत्रधनं धान्यं हृत्पञ्चादिगवे रथं ।  
 प्रजानां भवसी<sup>t</sup> माता आयुष्मन्तं करोतु मे<sup>u</sup> ॥ १९ ॥ ४ ॥  
 धनमग्निर्धनं वायुर्धनं सूर्यो धनं वसुः ।  
 धनमिन्द्रो बृहस्पतिर्वरुणं<sup>x</sup> धनमश्रुते<sup>y</sup> ॥ २० ॥  
 वैततेय सोमं पिब सोमं पिबतु वृत्रहा ।  
 सोमं धनस्य सोमिनो मयं<sup>z</sup> ददातु सोमिनः ॥ २१ ॥  
 न क्रोधो न च मात्सर्यं<sup>a</sup> न लोभो नाशुभा मतिः ।  
 भवति कृतपुण्यानां भक्तानां श्रीसूक्तं जपेत् ॥ २२ ॥<sup>b</sup>  
 सरसिजनिलये सरोजहस्ते धवलतरां शुभगंधमात्यशोभे ।  
 भगवति हरिवल्लभे मनोऽंशे त्रिभुवनभूतिकरि प्रसीद मङ्गं ॥ २३ ॥  
 श्रीवर्चस्मायुष्ममारोग्यमारुहात्पवमानं<sup>c</sup> महीयते ।  
 धनं धान्यं<sup>d</sup> पशुं बहुपुत्रलाभं शतसंवत्सरं दीर्घमायुः ॥ २४ ॥ ५ ॥

S. 3. adds after ver. 23. the following verses :

पद्मासने पद्मिनि पद्मपत्रे प्रसन्नप्रिये पद्मदलायताक्षि ।  
 विश्वप्रिये विश्वमनोऽनुकूले त्वत्पादपद्मं मयि संनिधास्व ॥  
 विष्णुपत्नीं क्षमां देवी माधवी माधवप्रियां ।  
 लक्ष्मीं प्रियसखीं देवी नमाम्यच्युतवज्रभां ॥  
 महालक्ष्मी च विभवे विष्णुपत्नी च धीमहि ।  
 तन्नो लक्ष्मि प्रचोदयात् ॥  
 आनन्दकर्म श्रीदश्रिक्तीत इव विश्रुतः ।  
 चण्डरोगादिदारिद्र्यपापक्षुद्रप मृत्यवः ।  
 रोगशोकमनस्तापा नश्यंतु सर्वदा ॥

Then follows verse 24.

On the margin of the same leaf S. 3. adds the following verses in red ink. The first three verses are addressed to Śiva, and followed by two addressed to Viṣṇu. Kullūka, in his Commentary on Manu III. 233, explains खिलानि by श्रीसूक्तशिवसंकल्पादीनि; and it is not unlikely, therefore, that he knew the Śrīsūkta as followed by some verses addressed to Śiva.

विश्वेश्वर विरूपाक्ष विश्वरूप सदा शिव ।  
 शरणं भव भूतेश करुणा कर शंकर ॥ १ ॥  
 हर शंभो महादेव विश्वेशामरवज्रभ ।  
 शिव शंकर सर्वोत्तमलीलकंठ नमोऽस्तु ते ॥ २ ॥

<sup>t</sup> सि S. 3.

<sup>u</sup> करोम्यहं S. 1.

<sup>x</sup> वरुणं धनमुत्सृजे S. 1.

<sup>y</sup> धनमश्रुता S. 3.

<sup>z</sup> मङ्गं S. 3. मिहं S. 1.

<sup>a</sup> मात्सर्यं S. 3.

<sup>b</sup> S. 1. inserts here the verse पद्मानने, and

then repeats ver. 16: यः शुचिः.

<sup>c</sup> मारोग्यमाविधात्पव<sup>o</sup> S. 1. 3.

<sup>d</sup> धान्यं धनं S. 3.

मृत्युञ्जयाय रुद्राय नीलकण्ठाय शंभवे ।  
 अमृतेशाय शर्वाय श्रीमहादेवाय ते नमः ॥ ३ ॥  
 एतानि शिवनामानि यः पठेन्नियतः सकृत् ।  
 नास्ति मृत्युभयं तस्य पापयोगादि किञ्चन ॥  
 यज्ञेशाच्युत गोविन्द माधवानन्त केशव ।  
 कृष्ण विष्णो हृषीकेश वासुदेव नमोऽस्तु ते ॥ १ ॥  
 कृष्णाय गोपिनाथाय चक्रिणे मुरवैरिणे ।  
 अमृतेशाय गोपाय गोविन्दाय नमो नमः ॥ २ ॥  
 एतान्यनन्तनामानि मंडलानि (सदा) पठेत् ।

## Maṇḍala VI.

Besides the MSS. hitherto used, I possess for the sixth Maṇḍala a copy which I took from the MS. in the Paris Library. This MS. belongs to the A. class, and where it has peculiar readings they are marked by P.

- P. 571. l. 7. (VI. 1, 2.) स्तुत्या A. स्तुत्या Ca.  
 P. 572. l. 11. (VI. 1, 5.) उभयास ॥ त्वां उभयास A. Ca. त्वा उभयास B.  
 P. 573. l. 11. (VI. 1, 7.) दिवः स्वर्गमनयः A. दिवः । स्वर्गः ॥ अनयः Ca. दिवः स्वर्गः तं अनयः B.  
 P. 573. l. 12. (VI. 1, 7.) गमय इति वा A. गमय इति Ca. गमयेति ?  
 P. 575. l. 16. (VI. 1, 13.) स्वामीत्येषदं A. भरतस्वामी वसुतायेत्येषदं Ca. वसुतेत्येतत्पदं may have been the original reading, unless Bharatasvāmi took the two words वसुता ते as one. In this case the reading ought to be वसुतात इत्येषदं ।  
 P. 575. l. 18. (VI. 1, 13.) B. Ca. have वसूनि त्वे त्वां.  
 P. 580. l. 11. (VI. 2, 9.) असीति ॥ अशीति Ca. वासीति A. अपीति शेषः B.  
 P. 582. l. 11. (VI. 3, 2.) शांतः B. आंतः A. आत Ca.  
 P. 583. l. 6. (VI. 3, 4.) स्मृष्टं ॥ प्रष्टुं Ca. स्मृष्टं A.  
 P. 583. l. 11. (VI. 3, 4.) धनं A. धनं Ca.  
 P. 583. l. 12. (VI. 3, 4.) मूर्त्तभूतं सर्वं Ca.  
 P. 584. l. 6. (VI. 3, 4.) जालाः B.; deest in A. Ca.  
 P. 584. l. 23. (VI. 3, 7.) दीप्तेन to गमनशीलेन from Ca.  
 P. 585. l. 9. (VI. 3, 8.) सर्वं तीक्ष्णीकरोति Ca. after तनूकरोति; deest in A. B.  
 P. 586. l. 11. (VI. 4, 2.) प्रवृद्धो ॥ प्रवृद्धो A. B. Ca.  
 P. 586. l. 17. (VI. 4, 3.) उपमार्यस्य A. Ca. उपमानस्य Nirukta.  
 P. 587. l. 5. (VI. 4, 4.) स्वभावत्वं एव A. स्वभावेनैव Ca.  
 P. 587. l. 8. (VI. 4, 4.) निवस A. निवससि B. निवासेः Ca.  
 P. 587. l. 15. (VI. 4, 5.) यद्भिः ॥ यद्भिः A. यद्भिः B. Ca.  
 P. 587. l. 20. (VI. 4, 5.) अरातीरातिरदाता ॥ अरातीः अरातिवदतो (वदातो pr. man.) A. अरातीः अरातिवदतो Ca. अरातीः अरातीर्भ° B.  
 P. 587. l. 21. (VI. 4, 5.) आचक्षाणानां ॥ आचक्षाणां A. Ca.

P. 588. l. 12. (VI. 4, 6.) दिग्भागात् ॥ दिग्नामात् A. Ca.

P. 589. l. 4. (VI. 4, 8.) वेषि गमनाय प्रापयः B. Ca.

P. 589. l. 7. (VI. 4, 8.) वीर्योज्जा<sup>०</sup> Ca. वीरज्जा A.

P. 590. l. 15. (VI. 5, 3.) विश्वांतरात्मना B. Ca. वैश्वात्मना A.

P. 591. l. 4. (VI. 5, 4.) तृप्तम A. तपस्वितम Ca. तपस्विन् B.: cf. Nir. VI. 12.

P. 592. l. 21. (VI. 6, 1.) उपमंतव्यं A. B. Ca.

P. 592. l. 22. (VI. 6, 1.) नवीयसा after नव्यसा Ca.

P. 594. l. 15. (VI. 6, 5.) After प्र पापतीति । प्रकर्षेण, Ca. leaves out all to the beginning of the next hymn. B. supplies this lacuna quite arbitrarily to verse 7, where it copies from A.: प्र पापतीति प्रकर्षेण पतति दृष्टांतः गोषुयुषः उदकनिमिज्जात् घातकोऽग्निर्न अग्निरिव सः यथा पतति तद्वत् अपि च दुर्वैदुः दुहाहकज्वालाभिर्वैतमानस्य अग्नेः भीमः भयंकरः स्थातिः द्रव्यैः वनानि दयते दहति दृष्टांतः शूरस्येव प्रसितिः यथा शूरस्य बाधकं शौर्यं प्राणिनां घातकं भवति तद्वत् ॥ ६ ॥ आ भानुनेति ॥ हे अग्ने स त्वं महः महानु पार्थिवानि पृथिव्यां वर्तमानानि अयांसि व्यवहारार्थं इतस्ततः गच्छमानानि भूतानि ततंय विस्तारय बाधकं वारयेत्यर्थः । अपि च तोदस्य तोदं प्राणिनामुपद्रवं घृषता भानुना घर्षकेन तेजसा आ समंतात् बाधस्य अपि चा य भया चलहिते सहोर्भिर्वलैः हे वनुषः कृद्वाग्ने वनुष्यत् क्रोधं कुर्वन् स्पृधः अस्मत् शत्रून् नि जूर्वं नितरां जय घातयेत्यर्थः ॥ ७ ॥

P. 594. l. 16. (VI. 6, 5.) सृजाना दाहोत्पाद्यमाना B.

P. 594. l. 18. (VI. 6, 5.) यथान्यैर्दुः सहं ॥ यथान्ये दुःसह A.

P. 596. l. 22. (VI. 7, 2.) That the MS. of Sáyana at Paris, which I copied for the sixth Maṇḍala, belongs to the A. class can be clearly proved, for the first time, by VI. 7, 2. Here the Paris MS. reads (ग्रा)ह्यितारं गमयितारं; A. has ह्यितारं (in the margin ग्रा) गमयितारं; Ca. has ग्रहीतारं, and leaves out गमयितारं.

P. 599. l. 7. (VI. 8, 1.) The second Vinīyoga is only in C. Mill and the Paris copy.

P. 600. l. 4. (VI. 8, 2.) व्रतानि कर्माणि B. व्रतानि व्रतानि कर्माणि C. Mill, A. P. व्रतानि व्रत-  
कर्माणि Ca.

P. 600. l. 19. (VI. 8, 3.) शोषणार्थं B. शोषणार्थं Ca. A., C. Mill, P.

P. 601. l. 1. (VI. 8, 4.) मध्ये from B. Ca.

P. 602. l. 6. (VI. 8, 7.) हे इष्टे यष्टव्य B. Ca. इष्टे इष्टव्य A.

P. 602. l. 22. (VI. 9, 1.) रंजयंतौ ॥ रक्षयंतौ A. C. ईक्षयंतौ B.

P. 602. l. 23. (VI. 9, 1.) स्वप्रवृत्तिभिः from B. Ca.

P. 603. l. 13. (VI. 9, 2.) न विज्ञानामि यं पटं यत्नलक्षणं from Ca.

P. 603. l. 24. (VI. 9, 2.) न च तत्कार्यं पटस्थानीयं प्रपंचं विज्ञानामि यं प्रपंचं समरे A. न च तत्कार्यं  
पटस्थानीयान्यपि विषयादीनि न विज्ञानामि न च तत्कार्यं पटस्थानीयं प्रपंचसमरे Ca.

P. 605. l. 22. (VI. 9, 5.) निर्विकल्पं A. निर्विकारं Ca.

P. 605. l. 22. (VI. 9, 5.) मनसो Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā. मनो A. Ca.

P. 605. l. 23. (VI. 9, 5.) न केनचित् Ca. A. sec. man. न केचित् A. pr. man.

P. 611. l. 6. (VI. 11, 3.) After धनहेतुभूता, Ca. has धनं लभमाना वा धनगणं लभ्येति यत् ।

P. 612. l. 4. (VI. 11, 5.) आह्रियत् ॥ आह्रियत् A. आह्रिवत् Ca. आसाद्यते B.

P. 612. l. 4. (VI. 11, 5.) All is left out from सुष्ठु to अथापि in Ca. Consequently

B. contains an independent explanation of this passage: सुवृत्तिः शोभना स्तुतिः अम्प्यसि स्तूयते पृथिव्याः सदाने कस्मिंश्चित्तया सप्त सप्तनि यजमानगृहे यज्ञः अथापि यजमाने आश्रितो भवति.

P. 613. l. 16. (VI. 12, 2.) हंते° A. हंगते° Ca.

P. 614. l. 15. (VI. 12, 4.) क्त्वा न आत्मीयेन कर्मणा च B. क्त्वा न क्तुना आत्मीयेन कर्मणा च Ca. क्त्वा न क्तुना कर्मणा च A.

P. 615. l. 11. (VI. 12, 6.) अर्वन् गंतर° A., C. Mill, P. अर्वन् अंतर° B. Ca. अर्वन्तरा A. by correction.

P. 619. l. 13. (VI. 14, 3.) व्रतविरोधिनं यागविरोधिनं B. Ca.

P. 619. l. 21. (VI. 14, 4.) सतां B. Ca. सत्ये A.

P. 620. l. 6. (VI. 14, 5.) असंभक्तं तस्यैवासाधारणं B. Ca.

P. 630. l. 15. (VI. 16, 1.) यद्वा यज्ञानां Ca. यद्वा देवयज्ञानां A.

P. 632. l. 1. (VI. 16, 6.) मरणधर्मः A. मरणरहितः B. Ca.

P. 632. l. 11. (VI. 16, 8.) दृष्टारं A. Ca.

P. 634. l. 9. (VI. 16, 14.) अग्ने य उक्तगुण तमु A. अग्ने य उक्तः तमु Ca. अग्ने तमेव B.

P. 634. l. 15. (VI. 16, 15.) कश्चिद्वहिः गुण तमु तमेव त्वां अथर्वणः सोऽपि तमु तमेव त्वां A. pr. man. कश्चिद्वहिः स्तौति हे अग्ने तमु etc. A. by corrections. कश्चिद्वहिः स्तौति हे अग्ने तमु तमेव त्वां समीधे Ca. B.

P. 634. l. 15. (VI. 16, 15.) समैध A. साधु B. Ca.

P. 635. l. 2. (VI. 16, 16.) असुरैः A. Ca. अपरैः B.

P. 635. l. 3. (VI. 16, 16.) Ca. adds after शेषः the words यद्वा इत्या असुत दूरत एव इतरा असुर्या गिरः संतु ता अशृण्वन्नित्यर्थः 1.

P. 637. l. 16. (VI. 16, 25.) इच्छति ददातीत्यर्थः A. इच्छते ददातीत्यर्थः Ca. इच्छते ददासीत्यर्थः B.

P. 640. l. 15. (VI. 16, 35.) द्युलोकस्य A. B. द्युलोकस्यापि Ca.

P. 641. l. 8. (VI. 16, 38.) आश्रयणं सुखं वा Ca.

P. 641. l. 9. (VI. 16, 38.) यमार्त्ताः संतप्ताश्चायामुगागच्छन्ति B. Ca. यमार्त्तास्समुपागच्छन्ति A.

P. 646. l. 15. (VI. 17, 2.) तद्वा न गतसारमपि सोममपरित्यज्यन्यस्वं B. Ca.

P. 647. l. 1. (VI. 17, 3.) मदयतु A. मदयुक्तं करोतु B. Ca.

P. 647. l. 25. (VI. 17, 5.) अविचालितं from B. Ca.

P. 648. l. 6. (VI. 17, 6.) प्रज्ञया A. प्रकृत्या B. Ca.

P. 648. l. 8. (VI. 17, 6.) गोभ्यः<sup>†</sup> तादर्थ्यं चतुर्थी । Ca.

P. 649. l. 14. (VI. 17, 9.) °धुनास्मिन्काले त्वदीयाद्वाज्रात्सस्यात्मीयान्मन्योः क्रोधाच्च भियसा भयेन द्विता द्विधा द्विः प्रकोरेण कामेन मनसा च Ca. and B. pr. man. The reading of A., which has been adopted in the text, has been inserted by a later hand on the margin of B.

P. 650. l. 12. (VI. 17, 11.) आहवत्याख्यानि ॥ आहवनीयाख्यानि A. Ca. आध° B.

P. 652. l. 16. (VI. 18, 1.) वातेवातं ॥ वातेवांसं A. Ca.

P. 654. l. 1. (VI. 18, 4.) तुरतः अस्मान् हिंसतः B. Ca. तुरतः शत्रूणां हिंसन् A.

P. 654. l. 11. (VI. 18, 5.) स्तुत्यस्तोतु° Ca. स्तोतु° A.

P. 655. l. 17. (VI. 18, 8.) The Pada has चौत्त्याय; the Sanhitās and Commentary चौत्त्राय.

P. 656. l. 9. (VI. 18, 9.) जहि Ca. B.; deest in A. वैधकर्मा Ca. गैतिकर्मा A.; deest in B.

P. 656. l. 16. (VI. 18, 10.) यथाग्निः from B. तयाग्निः Ca.

P. 656. l. 20. (VI. 18, 10.) अध्वनयत् युद्धे गर्जनलक्षणं शब्दं A. अध्वनयतामुद्देगलक्षणं गर्जनं Ca.  
अध्वनयत् उद्देगलक्षणं गर्जनं B.

P. 657. l. 5. (VI. 18, 11.) बहुभिः बहुबलैः A. In Ca. all is left out after तुविवाजेभिः to आहूतेन्द्र. B. has बह्वैः यजमानैः हे पुरुहूत बहुभिः आहूतेन्द्र.

P. 657. l. 7. (VI. 18, 11.) अदेवो ॥ अदेवश्चित् A. Ca. अदेवः कश्चित् B.

P. 659. l. 21. (VI. 19, 1.) अहिंसनीयः A. अहिंसितो यः B. Ca.

P. 660. l. 6. (VI. 19, 2.) अवर्धयत A. वर्धते B. वर्धयते Ca.

P. 660. l. 25. (VI. 19, 4.) अनवद्याः पापरहिताः A. अनवद्याः अवद्यरहिताः Ca. अनवद्यरहिताः B.

P. 661. l. 9. (VI. 19, 5.) पथ्याः स्तोत्राणां हि रायो A. पथ्या तोषणाहितानि रायो Ca. पथ्या तोषणहि-  
तानि रायो B.

P. 665. l. 22. (VI. 20, 3.) पुरीणां A. असुरपुरीणां Ca. असुराणां पुरीणां B.

P. 666. l. 6. (VI. 20, 4.) अवतेरूपैणाथौच्छंदो गिरिर्विजः Ca. after दशोण्ये.

P. 666. l. 9. (VI. 20, 4.) Ca. has पद्यते दं रूपं after पलायंत.

P. 666. l. 20. (VI. 20, 5.) सारथिसूताय Ca. सुताय B. सारथिभूताय A.

P. 668. l. 4. (VI. 20, 8.) °वचनं ॥ °वचनं A. B. Ca.

P. 669. l. 11. (VI. 20, 11.) शत्रुभिः B. शत्रूणां A. Ca.

P. 669. l. 26. (VI. 20, 13.) सुन्वद्भी° S. 1. P. 2. सुन्वद्भी S. 2. सुन्वत् P. 1.

P. 670. l. 7. (VI. 20, 13.) पक्त्वान् ॥ पचनवान् A. B. Ca.

P. 671. l. 16. (VI. 21, 3.) प्रकाशवत् from B. Ca.

P. 673. l. 11. (VI. 21, 7.) स्थिरो A. B. Ca.

P. 673. l. 21. (VI. 21, 8.) अभिक्रामने A. अभिक्रामचरे Ca.

P. 674. l. 6. (VI. 21, 9.) पुरंधियं ॥ पुरंधियं A.; deest in B. Ca.: cf. Rv. I. 116, 13.

P. 676. l. 11. (VI. 22, 2.) The commentary to this verse is left out in A. Paris, C. Mill, and added at a later time in A. Colebr., apparently from Ca. The same happens in VI. 22, 9.

P. 676. l. 25. (VI. 22, 3.) जरहानिसहितः A. जरहरहितः B. Ca.

P. 678. l. 6. (VI. 22, 6.) अनेन B. Ca. अयानेन A., which omits अयानया before मायया.

P. 679. l. 2. (VI. 22, 8.) A. reads अंतरिक्षा. B. Ca. and all the MSS. of the text have अंतरिक्षा.

P. 679. l. 22. (VI. 22, 10.) संयती ॥ संयति A. संचनी Ca.

P. 680. l. 9. (VI. 22, 11.) अद्यागमस्य ॥ मद्यागमनस्य A. मद्यादिगिति गिति Ca.

P. 680. l. 21. (VI. 23, 1.) महति added from B. Ca., which leave out बृहति.

P. 681. l. 12. (VI. 23, 2.) अपरयः ॥ यपरयः A. pr. man. येरयः sec. man. चेरयः Ca.

P. 683. l. 14. (VI. 23, 7.) अमिविश A. उपविश B. Ca.

P. 683. l. 24. (VI. 23, 8.) प्राप्नुवंतु ॥ left out in A. B. Ca.

P. 683. l. 25. (VI. 23, 8.) प्राप्नुवंतु after स्तोत्राणि B. Ca. आयम्याः आगच्छंतु A.

P. 684. l. 16. (VI. 23, 10.) यः क्षयदीप्यते B. य इक्षतः । ईश्वर Ca. क्षय ईश्वरो A. All the MSS. of the text have क्षयत्.

P. 686. l. 2. (VI. 24, 3.) अतिरिच्यते B. Ca. प्ररिच्यते A.

P. 686. l. 11. (VI. 24, 4.) बहुकर्मन् A. बहुशक्तिन् B. Ca.

P. 686. l. 13. (VI. 24, 4.) यथा by conjecture.

P. 686. l. 14. (VI. 24, 4.) यत्त नियते ॥ यत्त नियते Ca. B. यस्य नियते A.

P. 686. l. 15. (VI. 24, 4.) सुदामन् सुहु शलूणां बंधक B., proprio motu.

P. 687. l. 5. (VI. 24, 5.) मित्रादयोऽप्यत्र स A. मित्रादयोऽप्यस्य Ca.

P. 688. l. 11. (VI. 24, 8.) बहुगुणाः A. बहुगुणाः Ca.

P. 688. l. 12. (VI. 24, 8.) सुगमनाः A. sec. man. असुगमनाः pr. man. असुरागमनाः B. Ca.

P. 690. l. 13. (VI. 25, 3.) हीनानि A. दीनानि B. Ca.

P. 691. l. 23. (VI. 25, 6.) अचस्वतौ उद्योगवतौ B.

P. 693. l. 8. (VI. 25, 9.) ते गृणंतः B. त्व त्वः ॥ गृणंतः Ca. ते त्वन्नः गृणंतः A.

P. 694. l. 8. (VI. 26, 2.) प्रतिभालयते Ca. प्रतिपालयत A.; deest in B.

P. 695. l. 12. (VI. 26, 5.) यत् is not explained in A. B. Ca.

P. 696. l. 21. (VI. 26, 8.) प्रतर्दनो Ca. प्रातर्दनो A. B.

P. 698. l. 16. (VI. 27, 4.) तस्य शेषः B. Ca.

P. 698. l. 18. (VI. 27, 4.) यत् before यस्मात् deest in A. Ca. इत् युष्मात् यस्मात् बलात् B.

P. 699. l. 5. (VI. 27, 5.) प्राग्भागे A. पूर्वभागे B. Ca.

P. 701. l. 4. (VI. 28, 1.) प्रजावतीः प्रजावत्यः संततिसहिताः पूर्वीः बह्वयः इंद्राय इंद्रार्थे उषः उषः कालान् प्रति दुहानाः दोग्ध्रः स्युर्भवेयुः B. प्रजावतीः प्रजावत्यः संततिसहिताः स्युर्भवेयुः Ca. प्रजावतीः प्रजावदोहमाना भवेयुः A. pr. man. प्रजावतीः प्रजावत्यः सहिताः दो° A. in marg.

P. 701. l. 12. (VI. 28, 2.) अपि तु A. अपि च B. Ca.

P. 702. l. 11. (VI. 28, 4.) रेणोः B. Ca. रेणुकस्य रेणोः A.

P. 702. l. 14. (VI. 28, 4.) प्रदेश B. प्रवेश A. Ca.

P. 702. l. 21. (VI. 28, 5.) छदेरिदं रूपं Ca. after यच्छतु.

P. 702. l. 23. (VI. 28, 5.) संश्रयणात् A. संस्क्रियमाणत्वात् B. Ca.

P. 703. l. 6. (VI. 28, 6.) चेहयथ after नेदयथ B. Ca.

P. 703. l. 6. (VI. 28, 6.) आप्यायनं B. Ca. आप्यायं A.

P. 703. l. 9. (VI. 28, 6.) यागपरिषत्सु A. गपरिषत्सु Ca. परिषत्सु B.

P. 703. l. 9. (VI. 28, 6.) सर्वैर्दीयत A. Ca. सर्वैर् दीयत B.

P. 703. l. 15. (VI. 28, 7.) भवतेति ॥ भवतीति A. B. Ca.

P. 703. l. 19. (VI. 28, 7.) मा परिवृज्याः and न परिहरतु A.

P. 705. l. 14. (VI. 29, 2.) बालयेन Ca. after हस्ते, and A. Colebr. in the margin.

P. 705. l. 15. (VI. 29, 2.) वर्तमाना etc. ॥ वर्तमानान् रातयः Ca. वर्तमानान् हिता रायः A.

P. 705. l. 18. (VI. 29, 2.) अभिवर्षति ॥ अभिवर्षति A. अभिवर्षयति Ca.

P. 705. l. 20. (VI. 29, 2.) आयम्यते A. आश्रीयते Ca. आमिमिक्षुः B.

P. 707. l. 16. (VI. 29, 6.) हिनस्तु A. हंतु B. Ca.

P. 710. l. 4. (VI. 31, 1.) पृष्ठस्य ॥ पृष्ठय A. Ca.

- P. 711. l. 9. (VI. 31, 3.) युध्यमानं B. Ca. after कुत्सेन.
- P. 713. l. 10. (VI. 32, 2.) वलेन स्थापितं पर्वतं A. विलेन स्थापितं Ca. विले स्थापितं B.
- P. 713. l. 13. (VI. 32, 2.) गुणानः स्तूयमानः is inserted in B. after संगिरोभिः.
- P. 713. l. 13. (VI. 32, 2.) वलस्य भृत्यैः A. वलवद्भिः Ca.; left out in B.
- P. 714. l. 9. (VI. 32, 4.) प्रजाभिः B. °वैहवाभि A. यहवाभि Ca.
- P. 715. l. 20. (VI. 33, 2.) अस्त्रापयः after अशत्रापयः Ca.
- P. 716. l. 1. (VI. 33, 3.) तान्वक्ष्यमाणानुभयान् B. Ca.
- P. 716. l. 1. (VI. 33, 3.) द्विप्रकारान् after उभयविधान् Ca.
- P. 717. l. 1. (VI. 33, 5.) गोषतमाः is not explained in A. गवां सङ्कृततमाः B. गवां सङ्कृतसाः Ca.
- गवां संभङ्कृतमा ?
- P. 718. l. 9. (VI. 34, 3.) भृशं खिद्यते A. शङ्कते Ca.; deest in B.
- P. 718. l. 11. (VI. 34, 3.) वर्धयंत्यो from B.
- P. 719. l. 1. (VI. 34, 4.) Sāyana takes सं यत् as a participle from सं इ.
- P. 720. l. 8. (VI. 35, 2.) Ca. omits all from संक्षेपयेः to संग्रामान्. B. gives a different explanation, नीयासे संहर त्वं आजीन्.
- P. 720. l. 21. (VI. 35, 3.) आत्मनि योजयेः B. Ca. आत्मना नियोजयेः A.
- P. 721. l. 3. (VI. 35, 4.) आह्वादयन्तीः A. आह्वादिताः B. Ca.
- P. 722. l. 17 and 19. (VI. 36, 2.) वृजंति S. 1, S. 3. sec. man., Pada 2. वृजंति P. 1, S. 2, S. 3. pr. man.
- P. 724. l. 18. (VI. 37, 1.) स्व सुषु वरणीयं A. B. Ca. सुषुवरणीयं is the usual explanation.
- P. 724. l. 19. (VI. 37, 1.) गुणजातं B. Ca. जातं A.
- P. 725. l. 17. (VI. 37, 3.) पुरैव ॥ पुनैव A. The passage is left out in Ca. B. supplies the omission by कीदृशा अस्याः वायोः विदस्येत् वायोगेन नमति कामत् यथा तथा गच्छत ।.
- P. 726. l. 2. (VI. 37, 4.) विनाशयसि from B. Ca.
- P. 729. l. 1. (VI. 39, 1.) सेव्यस्य from B. Ca.
- P. 731. l. 14. (VI. 40, 2.) Áśvalāyana gives the whole Páda (अस्य to इन्द्र).
- P. 731. l. 23. (VI. 40, 2.) अयण° Ca. अयण° A.
- P. 732. l. 6. (VI. 40, 3.) सम्यगिधनैः Ca. before दीप्ते.
- P. 732. l. 25. (VI. 40, 5.) पारये A. Ca. पराये B. पारये ?
- P. 735. l. 12. (VI. 41, 5.) प्रजासु from B.
- P. 736. l. 13. (VI. 42, 2.) चृजेर्गैत्यर्थः । तद्भावसाधन ॥ चृजेर्गैत्यर्थः । तद्भावसाधना । Ca. चृजेर्गैत्यर्थभा-  
वसाधन A. चृजेर्गैत्यर्थात् भावसाधन चृजीषशब्दः B.
- P. 736. l. 15. (VI. 42, 2.) अन्य आह A. अन्यथाहा Ca.
- P. 738. l. 6. (VI. 43, 3.) Ca. gives as the beginning of this verse, अथ तृतीया । यस्य ना अंतर्निर्दिष्टः ; but this is followed by the commentary to the 4th verse: exactly the same occurs in B.
- P. 740. l. 12. (VI. 44, 4.) अनुग्राहकं A. अनुग्रहकं Ca.
- P. 741. l. 5. (VI. 44, 6.) विस्तार्यत A. B. विस्तार्य Ca.
- P. 741. l. 7. (VI. 44, 6.) यस्मिंश्चेद्रे ॥ यस्मिन् खेद्रे A. यस्मिंश्चिद्रे B. Ca.

P. 742. l. 4. (VI. 44, 8.) आत्मीयं B. आत्मीयं च A. आत्मीयं च Ca. From this verse B. gives again the complete commentary; agreeing, as formerly, more with A. than Ca. The Vinīyogas, however, are omitted.

P. 749. l. 14. (VI. 44, 24.) हेतुगर्भवि° A. हेतुगर्भवि° B. गर्भहेतुवि° Ca.: cf. Sāyaṇa VIII. 2, 5 and 7.

P. 749. l. 24. The Sanhitās contain at the end of the 44th hymn (Asht. IV. 7, 20.) the following Khila:

चक्षुश्च श्रोत्रं च मनश्च वाक् प्राणापानौ देह इदं शरीरं ।  
 द्वौ प्रत्यंचावनुलोमौ विसर्गवितं तं मन्ये<sup>a</sup> दशयन्तमुत्तं ॥ १ ॥  
 उरश्च पृष्ठश्च<sup>b</sup> करौ च बाहू जघे चोह उदरं शिरश्च ।  
 रोमाणि<sup>c</sup> मांसं रुधिरास्थिमज्जनेतच्छरीरं जलबुद्बुदोपमं ॥ २ ॥<sup>d</sup>  
 भुवौ ललाटे च तथा च कर्णौ हनु<sup>e</sup> कपोलौ ह्रस्वकस्तथा<sup>f</sup> च ।  
 ओष्ठौ च दंताश्च तथैव जिह्वा मे तच्छरीरं मुखरत्नकोशं ॥ ३ ॥

P. 749. l. 26. (VI. 45, 1.) अतिनिवृत् A. Ca. अतिनिवृत् B. Ibidem, पादनिवृत् A. B. Ca. अतिनिवृत् B. Ca. °च° A. The Anukramanī has च°.

P. 751. l. 19. (VI. 45, 6.) अस्मभ्यं ॥ अस्मान् A. B. Ca.

P. 753. l. 14. (VI. 45, 13.) तंतस ॥ तंतसाप्य A. तंसाय B. तस Ca.: cf. Rv. VI. 18, 6.

P. 756. l. 6. (VI. 45, 23.) सीमयं ॥ सीमं A. सी B.; left out in Ca.

P. 757. l. 4. (VI. 45, 26.) मापयितुं A. Ca. नाशयितुं B.

P. 757. l. 26. (VI. 45, 29.) त्वां from B.

P. 758. l. 10. (VI. 45, 31.) Ca. has in the margin, written by a later hand, बृबुर्नाम राजर्षिः काष्ठच्छित् । A. Colebr. also has in the margin राजर्षिः, marked to be inserted after नाम. The Calcutta edition of Manu reads चक्षु instead of बृबु; विजने instead of निजने; and महातपाः instead of महायशाः.

P. 758. l. 13. (VI. 45, 31.) कूले Ca. A. कुले B. जातितो A. B. ज्ञानतो Ca.

P. 759. l. 1. (VI. 45, 33.) तत्तं ॥ तत् B. A. नूनं Ca.

P. 759. l. 4. (VI. 45, 33.) धनस्य वा A.; deest in Ca. धनस्य वादौ B.

P. 759. l. 24. (VI. 46, 1.) यत्ताश्चः ॥ यथाश्चः A. B. अश्चः Ca.

P. 762. l. 20. (VI. 46, 8.) राजनि A. B. जने Ca.

P. 763. l. 9. (VI. 46, 9.) शत्रुप्रेरितं ॥ सर्वप्रेरितं ष A. सर्वर्षिप्रेरितं B. प्रेरिशक्नुमत् Ca.

P. 763. l. 19. (VI. 46, 10.) अंतमो अंतिमो Ca.

P. 764. l. 2. (VI. 46, 11.) यद्यदा before पण्डिनः A. B. Ca.

P. 764. l. 23. (VI. 46, 13.) महतो धनस्य from Ca.

P. 764. l. 24. (VI. 46, 13.) प्रेरयेः A. प्रेरयसि Ca.; wanting in B. Again, in the next

<sup>a</sup> त्वं मन्ये all, except S. 3.

<sup>b</sup> पृष्ठीश्च S. 2.

<sup>c</sup> लोमानि S. 3.

<sup>d</sup> In S. 3. the

order of these two verses is inverted.

<sup>e</sup> हनुः S. 1.

<sup>f</sup> चुबुकः S. 3.



verse B. has प्रेरये; corrected to प्रेरयसि, and the second time प्रेरयसि. A. has प्रेरये; and प्रेरयसि; Ca. प्रेरयसे and प्रेरयसि ।

P. 765. l. 12. (VI. 46, 14.) ग्रहीतव्ये A. गृहीते Ca. गृहीता गृहीते B.

P. 768. l. 19. (VI. 47, 6.) सैर्वेदं हि A. B 1. सं चं हि Ca. पूरयस्व ऐदं हि.

P. 771. l. 11. (VI. 47, 12.) अभयरहितं A. Ca.; wanting in B.; probably to be corrected into °रहितत्वं ।

P. 772. l. 8. (VI. 47, 14.) अपराधीन् ॥ अयराधीन् A. B. Ca., and again अयराद्भ्यः A. B. Ca.

P. 773. l. 8. (VI. 47, 16.) पूर्वमपरं ॥ पूर्वं ॥ त इत्येवं B. पूर्वत इत्येवं A. पूर्वस इत्येवं Ca. पूर्वमपरं is taken from an old fragment of Sáyana's Commentary.

P. 773. l. 9. (VI. 47, 16.) वर्धमानानां from B.

P. 774. l. 4. (VI. 47, 18.) प्रतिनियतदर्शनाय A. नियत° Ca. प्रतिदर्शनाय B.

P. 775. l. 16. (VI. 47, 20.) नोस्मान् (नास्मात् A. Paris and C. Mill) अतः सापिरेक्षतु A. अस्मान् अतः ॥ कारणात् हे वृह° etc. Ca.; left out in B.

P. 775. l. 17. (VI. 47, 20.) प्रवेदयः Ca. प्रदेवय A. प्रचोदय B.

P. 778. l. 21. (VI. 47, 28.) शीघ्रगामी ॥ शीघ्रगामिनं A. B. Ca.

P. 779. l. 13. (VI. 47, 29.) वधकर्मणः A. Ca. शब्दकर्मणः B. and Roth's edition.

P. 781. l. 3. (VI. 48, 1.) यवमध्यांता A. B. Ca. यवमध्या Anukramanī.

P. 781. l. 4. (VI. 48, 1.) तृतीयद्वा° ॥ तृतीया द्वादशका अष्टकेति A. तृतीयो द्वादशको अष्टकेति B. तृतीयो द्वादशकेति Ca.

P. 785. l. 11. (VI. 48, 8.) कर्तारि ॥ कर्तारं A. B. Ca.

P. 786. l. 15. (VI. 48, 11.) यागाय B. यामाय A. Ca.

P. 788. l. 5. (VI. 48, 15.) पूषणं पोषकं from B.

P. 791. l. 8. (VI. 48, 22.) From सकृत् to सकृत् only in A. Colebr., and partly in B.

P. 791. l. 11. S. 1. has at the end of this hymn the following verse :

यस्तृणैरध्ययनं तदधीतिं स्तृणानि भवते भव ।

वार्षीकूपतडागानां समुद्रं गच्छ स्वाहा ॥

सूक्तांते स्तृणान्यग्नौ ॥

P. 795. l. 5. (VI. 49, 7.) A. Paris and C. Mill have a lacuna after धर्षितुमश° to वृष्ठा तपसे at the end of the 11th verse.

P. 795. l. 14. (VI. 49, 8.) वचस्या वचसा Ca.

P. 795. l. 26. (VI. 49, 9.) तत्प्रजायत B. तयत A. तय Ca.

P. 797. l. 1. (VI. 49, 11.) नभस्तलं Ca. नभस्यलं A. B.

P. 797. l. 2. (VI. 49, 11.) देशश्चित्वां देशश्चित्तः B. Ca.

P. 797. l. 10. (VI. 49, 12.) क्षिप्रगमनाय A. क्षिप्रगामिने B. Ca.

P. 800. l. 17. (VI. 50, 3.) महो महत् ॥ वृहन्महत् A. Ca. महत् B.

P. 801. l. 25. (VI. 50, 6.) प्रदेयात् Ca. प्रदद्यात् B. B 1; left out in A.

P. 803. l. 12. (VI. 50, 10.) परिचरणकैः A. परिचारकैः Ca. परिचारकैः B.

P. 810. l. 12. (VI. 51, 11.) क्षाम निवासभूमिं Ca. क्षां ता निवास तादृशाः भूमिं B. क्षां भूमिं A.

- P. 811. l. 21. (VI. 51, 14.) अदातारं A. B. आदातारं Ca.  
P. 811. l. 22. (VI. 51, 14.) अदानपरः B. आदान A. Ca.  
P. 813. l. 2. (VI. 52, 1.) यियक्षुरास ॥ इयक्षुरास B. इयक्षुराह Ca. इयक्षाह A.  
P. 813. l. 16. (VI. 52, 2.) खस्याधि° ॥ खस्याधि° A. स्थाधि° B. Ca.  
P. 814. l. 3. (VI. 52, 3.) दूष्यमाणान् Ca. घृष्यमाणान् A. दुष्यमाणान् B.  
P. 815. l. 18. (VI. 52, 7.) निपखा भवत A. उपाविष्टा भवन्तु B. निपीदत उपविशत Ca.  
P. 816. l. 20. (VI. 52, 12.) यथानुपूर्व्या A. B. Ca.  
P. 817. l. 17. (VI. 52, 14.) चित्तेन ॥ चित्तेव A. B. चित्तेव Ca. चितैव ?  
P. 818. l. 6. (VI. 52, 15.) माया before प्रज्ञानान् from B.  
P. 824. l. 25. (VI. 55, 1.) Ca. has after संगच्छावहै the remark, यद्वा आवागम्यस्याद्याक्षरलोपे  
वामिति भवति । आवां सचावहै इति संबंधः ॥  
P. 826. l. 7. (VI. 55, 6.) निर्गुभाः etc. : cf. Nir. VI. 3.  
P. 827. l. 10. (VI. 56, 4.) स्तुतेन्द्र A. B.  
P. 827. l. 10. (VI. 56, 4.) यदुद्दिश्य Ca. यमुद्दिश्य A. यत् यमुद्दिश्य B. It was probably  
यदुत्तमुद्दिश्य.  
P. 828. l. 2. (VI. 56, 6.) सर्वदा deest in B.  
P. 829. l. 4. (VI. 57, 4.) इन्द्रः after यद्यदा A. B. Ca.  
P. 829. l. 10. (VI. 57, 5.) इन्द्रस्य after देवस्य by conjecture. B. inserts it at the  
beginning of the verse.  
P. 829. l. 18. (VI. 57, 6.) यथा before आकर्षति by conjecture.  
P. 829. l. 22. (VI. 58, 1.) वैश्वदेवस्य A. पौष्णस्य Ca.  
P. 830. l. 8. (VI. 58, 1.) प्रकाशेन ॥ प्रकाशन Ca. प्रकाशे A. B.  
P. 830. l. 10. (VI. 58, 1.) एकं after अन्यत् by conjecture. The passage is left out  
in B. Ca.  
P. 830. l. 15. (VI. 58, 1.) पूषन् after अन्नवन् from Ca.  
P. 830. l. 17. (VI. 58, 1.) यज्ञियं ते अन्यदयज्ञियं ते अन्यदिति वा A. Ca. यजतं ते अन्यदयज्ञियं ते अन्यत्  
B. and Roth's edition.  
P. 830. l. 18. (VI. 58, 1.) कर्मणी A. B. Ca. कर्म Roth's edition.  
P. 831. l. 15. (VI. 58, 3.) प्राहैषीत् ॥ प्राहौषीत् A. B. Ca., a common mistake of the  
MSS., which must be corrected also in vol. I. p. 477. l. 20. and p. 919. l. 16.  
P. 831. l. 17. (VI. 58, 3.) Sáyana mistook the voc. कृत for the nom. कृतः.  
P. 832. l. 1. (VI. 58, 4.) अस्मिनो वरुणादयो Ca.  
P. 833. l. 4. (VI. 59, 2.) श्रूयते Ca. स्तूयते A. B.  
P. 833. l. 10. (VI. 59, 3.) संगतौ after समवेतौ from B. Ca.  
P. 833. l. 22. (VI. 59, 4.) वाक् only in A., and struck out by a later hand in A. Colebr.  
P. 833. l. 22. (VI. 59, 4.) जोषं after प्रीतिकरं repeated in A. B. Ca.  
P. 833. l. 24. (VI. 59, 4.) भक्षयः Ca. भक्ष्यः B. भजयः A.  
P. 833. l. 25. (VI. 59, 4.) The passage from Yáska is left out in B.; Ca. con-  
cludes with सुतेष्वादि.

- P. 834. l. 1. (VI. 59, 4.) तेष्वातस्य वर्षयितायै न A.; not in Roth's edition.
- P. 834. l. 1. (VI. 59, 4.) योऽयं ॥ अथ योऽयं Roth's edition. जोषं A.
- P. 834. l. 12. (VI. 59, 5.) Some substantive is required after व्यापकान्; it was probably दिवसान्.
- P. 836. l. 26. (VI. 60, 1.) वसुसमूहस्य from Ca. वासयितव्यस्य B.; deest in A.
- P. 841. l. 24. (VI. 61, 1.) The Rig-vidhāna reads द्विजः । नितं जपेत् ।
- P. 842. l. 23. (VI. 61, 2.) पारावौची A. पाराची Ca.; not in B., where the latter part of the verse is left out.
- P. 843. l. 13. (VI. 61, 4.) क्रियायां from B.
- P. 844. l. 19. (VI. 61, 9.) Ca. has कृतावरी उदकवती at the beginning of the verse, but omits from तथा to अतिनयतु. A. and B. read कृतावरी; against the text.
- P. 844. l. 20. (VI. 61, 9.) छंदसीति Ca. छान्दसः A. B.
- P. 844. l. 21. (VI. 61, 9.) अतिनयतु B. अभि नयतु A.
- B., as before, gives only an extract of the commentary from the beginning of the 5th Ashtaka. B 1., however, is more complete; and as the two MSS. begin to differ, the various readings of each have been noted, where they seemed to be of importance.
- P. 847. l. 17. (VI. 62, 1.) प्रसंतौ ॥ प्रसनवंतौ A. B. Ca. प्रसवंतौ B 1.
- P. 847. l. 18. (VI. 62, 1.) अश्वैरन्वितौ ॥ अश्विनौ (twice) अश्वैरन्वितौ A. Paris and C. Mill. अश्वैरश्विनौ A.; not in B 1. B 4. Ca.
- P. 847. l. 18. (VI. 62, 1.) अर्चनीयमंत्रसाधैः A. मंत्रसाधैः B. अप्रगीतमंत्र° साधैः Ca. B 1.
- P. 848. l. 2. (VI. 62, 1.) तमोनिवारणात् परियु° ॥ तमोनिवारणात् पर्युयू° Ca. °शान्यर्युयू° A.
- P. 849. l. 13. (VI. 62, 5.) शस्त्रैः B. Ca. शस्त्रेण B 1.
- P. 849. l. 16. (VI. 62, 5.) चलनशीलौ ॥ चलन or चलन Ca. चल A.; deest in B 4. चलन or चलन B 1.
- P. 851. l. 10. (VI. 62, 9.) मध्यम Ca. sec. man. उन्नम A. Ca. B 1.
- P. 851. l. 11. (VI. 62, 9.) ननु before ननुप्याणां A. and Ca. margin; not in A. Paris and C. Mill. न तु B 1. द्रोहायै नमा° Ca. B 1. द्रोहायै चमा° A.
- P. 853. l. 6. (VI. 63, 2.) The words from रिपो to असमदीयं, with the exception of गृहं before रिपो, which is given by conjecture, are taken from Ca. B 1. has the same as far as संतः; but omits the rest, तथा रक्षां.
- P. 853. l. 17. (VI. 63, 3.) नृष पृष नक्ष Ca. A. Paris and C. Mill. नृष नक्ष A. नक्ष पृष नक्ष नक्ष B 1.
- P. 854. l. 10. (VI. 63, 5.) अयितुं A. अय्यं Ca. अयेयं B. अय्यं B 1.
- P. 855. l. 1. (VI. 63, 6.) अन्वपतन् B 1. अनुपतन् A. B. Ca.
- P. 856. l. 6. (VI. 63, 9.) पुरुषात्पयानश्चान्वा Ca. B 1. and A. P. रयानश्चान्वा A.; left out in B 4.
- P. 856. l. 7. (VI. 63, 9.) अनुगुणाः A. Ca. B 1. अनुगुणान् B 4.
- P. 862. l. 13. (VI. 66, 1.) रूपं and विदुषे from A. Paris and C. Mill. वसुरुतं चिकितुषे स्तोत्रे B 1.

- P. 863. l. 7. (VI. 66, 3.) सर्वज्ञाता ॥ सर्वज्ञाते A. Ca. B 1. B 4.  
 P. 863. l. 9. (VI. 66, 3.) भवनाय B 1. सवनाय A. Ca. B 4.  
 P. 864. l. 3. (VI. 66, 5.) उच्चारयंतः A. B. Ca. धारयंतः A. P. and C. Mill.  
 P. 865. l. 13. (VI. 66, 8.) दीमस्यापि A. P. and C. Mill. दीमस्यावा A. pr. man. दीमस्या A. sec. man. द्योत दीमस्य B 1. दीमस्यास्या Ca. दीमस्यास्य B 4.  
 P. 866. l. 1. (VI. 66, 9.) य ॥ इय A. Ca. इयात् A. P. and C. Mill. इम B 1.  
 P. 866. l. 2. (VI. 66, 9.) राजपुरुष ॥ राजः पुरुष A., A. P., C. Mill, Ca. B 1.; deest in B 4.  
 P. 866. l. 16. (VI. 66, 11.) भाजमानच्छृङ्गिं । भाजमानायुधं B 4.  
 P. 868. l. 4. (VI. 67, 3.) वा after सूयमानौ A. Ca. B 1.  
 P. 868. l. 15. (VI. 67, 4.) प्रभूतौ B. प्रभूतांतौ A. Ca.  
 P. 870. l. 16. (VI. 67, 9.) यद्येऽयजंतो जनाः A. P., C. Mill. यद्ये यजः A. यद्य यजः Ca. यद्ये B 4. यत् ये यज B 1.  
 P. 870. l. 18. (VI. 67, 9.) न यज्ञयुक्ताः B 4. यज्ञयुक्ता न A. Ca. B 1.  
 P. 870. l. 19. (VI. 67, 9.) पुनंतीति पुत्राः । न पुत्रा अपुत्रा इत्यर्थः । A. Paris.  
 P. 872. l. 11. (VI. 68, 2.) Four leaves are wanting in A. Colebrooke. The lacuna extends from this verse to VII. 1, 2. Consequently for this part A. is represented only by A. Paris and C. Mill.  
 P. 873. l. 14. (VI. 68, 4.) स्तुतिभिर्वर्धयंते B. Ca. स्तुत्या वर्धते वर्धयंति A. P.; left out in C. Mill.  
 P. 874. l. 1. (VI. 68, 5.) प्रापेत् A. P., C. Mill. प्रापेत Ca. B 4. प्राप्यते B 1.  
 P. 875. l. 13. (VI. 68, 9.) सन्नाजे आज्ञया राज्ञां ज्ञासकाय B. Ca. सन्नाजोश्चाज्ञां ज्ञासकाय A. P., C. Mill.  
 P. 875. l. 16. (VI. 68, 9.) शोचिषा तेजसा युक्तः A. P., C. Mill. B. Ca., omitting this, have शोचिषा दीप्या after द्यावापृथिव्यौ.  
 P. 876. l. 12. (VI. 68, 11.) पात्रेषु B. Ca. पाने A. P., C. Mill.  
 P. 876. l. 18. (VI. 69, 1.) गाणगादिदेवत° ॥ गाणगादे देवत° Ca. गाणगादिदेवत° A. P., C. Mill. गाणगादिदेवत° Áśvaláyana. गाणगादिदेवता° B 1.  
 P. 877. l. 4. (VI. 69, 1.) कर्णेणो left out in B. Ca.  
 P. 877. l. 4. (VI. 69, 1.) सेवेषां ॥ सेवयेषां A. P., C. Mill; left out in B. Ca.  
 P. 878. l. 19. (VI. 69, 5.) विचक्रमापे not in B. Ca.  
 P. 879. l. 7. (VI. 69, 6.) सोमनिधानः ॥ सोमाभिधानः A. P., C. Mill. सोमाभिधानाः B 1.; deest in B 4. Ca.  
 P. 879. l. 13. (VI. 69, 7.) मध्वोऽस्य मदकरं सोमं सोमस्य सोमं A. P., C. Mill. अस्य सोमस्य इमं सोमं मध्वः मधुरं Ca. in marg. मध्वः मधुरस्य मधुरं अस्य सोमस्य इमं सोमं B 4. The whole passage omitted in B 1.  
 P. 880. l. 13. (VI. 70, 1.) The Sūtra is omitted in A. P., C. Mill, B 1. Ca. It stands in Áśvaláyana, Śrauta-Sūtra, IX. 5.: द्यूतवती भुवनानामभिध्रियेन्द्रं द्यूतुभिर्वैजवद्विः etc.  
 P. 881. l. 1. (VI. 70, 1.) धारणेन B. Ca. धारकेन A. P., C. Mill.  
 P. 881. l. 2. (VI. 70, 1.) बहुकार्ये वा भवतः B 1. Ca. बहुकार्येति भावः A. P., C. Mill.  
 P. 882. l. 14. (VI. 70, 4.) यागाः प्रवर्तते A. P., C. Mill. यागाः प्रवर्तते B. Ca.

P. 882. l. 21. (VI. 70, 5.) उदकार्ये कर्माणौ Ca. B 4. उदकार्ये कर्माणौ A. P., C. Mill. उदकार्ये कर्माणौ B 1.

P. 883. l. 10. (VI. 70, 6.) विश्वशंभुवा सर्वस्य भावयित्र्यौ from B 4.

P. 883. l. 18. (VI. 71, 1.) इत्यनूक्तिष्ठेत् is wanting in Áśvaláyana MS.

P. 884. l. 4. (VI. 71, 1.) सवनाय सुवनाय etc. ॥ सवनाय सवनाय सवनाय दानाय वा A. P. सवनाय सवनाय दानाय वा C. Mill. सवनाय दानाय वा B 1. Ca. सवनाय दानाय B 4. It might have been सवनाय सुवनाय प्रेरणाय दानाय वा.

P. 884. l. 21. (VI. 71, 3.) सुखकारिभिः A. P. सुखकैः B. Ca.; left out in C. Mill.

P. 885. l. 2. (VI. 71, 3.) शत्रुः taken from B. Ca. नोऽस्माकं is repeated before माकि in A. P., C. Mill, Ca. B 1.

P. 886. l. 4. (VI. 71, 6.) किंच बहुत्वा । Ca. A. B 1. किं बहुता B 4.

P. 886. l. 18. (VI. 72, 1.) अलभयतं च जनान् ॥ अलभयतं वा जानान् अलभयतं वा जानात् Ca. अलभयतं B 4. अलभयत वा जानान् B 1.

P. 887. l. 1. (VI. 72, 2.) व्युच्छंती ॥ व्युच्छंती व्युच्छन् Ca. व्युच्छंती व्यच्छतं B.

P. 888. l. 8. (VI. 72, 5.) शत्रुसैन्याभिभावुकं from B 4.

P. 888. l. 15. (VI. 73, 1.) Some words are left out after इति, which are to be supplied in this manner: स्विष्टकृतोऽनुवाक्या । सूत्रितं च । बृहस्पतिः समजयद्वसूनि. Cf. VII. 11, 2.

P. 889. l. 23. (VI. 73, 3.) संभक्तुकामः ॥ संभक्तुकामः A. P., C. Mill. संभक्तुमिच्छन् Ca. B 4. संभक्तुमिच्छन् B 1.

P. 891. l. 5. (VI. 74, 3.) शिथिलबंधं ॥ शिथिलं बंधं A. P., C. Mill. शिथिलबद्धं B 1. Ca.

P. 892. l. 3. (VI. 75, 1.) इधुस्तुरूपत्वात् etc. Ca. इधुस्तुरूपनिमित्तदेवताके A. P., C. Mill. इधुस्तुरूपत्वात् B 1.

P. 894. l. 1. (VI. 75, 4.) समनस्त्वेव from B. Ca. इव stands for यथा, otherwise we might write सजंती.

P. 894. l. 4. (VI. 75, 4.) चूर्वेगिभ्यां निः Ca. चूर्वेगिभ्यां विः A. P., C. Mill; omitted in B 1. The Sūtra is not to be found in the Unādi-sūtra, where चूर्वे and अग्नि are formed by a different rule.

P. 896. l. 24. (VI. 75, 10.) मेष्ट ॥ मा रिष्टा A. P., C. Mill. माष्ट B 4. मा इष्टिष्ट Ca. B 1.

P. 897. l. 18. (VI. 75, 11.) शर्मे शरणं प्रयच्छंतु A. शर्मे यच्छंतु Ca. शर्मे यच्छंति B 1.

P. 897. l. 25. (VI. 75, 12.) हठा from B. Ca.

P. 900. l. 8. (VI. 75, 18.) उरुतरं ॥ उरु तुभ्यं A. P., C. Mill, Ca. उरु B.

My copy of the Paris MS. terminates with the sixth Mandāla.

### Mandāla VII.

P. 901. l. 1. (VII. 1, 1.) The introduction and the commentary to the first verse are given from B 1. Ca. and C. Mill.

P. 901. l. 12. (VII. 1, 1.) Before प्रातरनुवाके, Ca. reads अविवाहन्तु. The whole passage omitted in C. Mill. Sāyana may have written अविवाक्येऽहनि, which, as I observed too late, is a reading supported by the authority of Dr. Stephenson's MS.

P. 902. l. 7. (VII. 1, 1.) आगम्यमतनवंतं वा ॥ आगम्य तनवतं वा Ca. B 1. अगम्यमतनतं वा C. Mill. गम्यं B 4.

P. 902. l. 8. (VII. 1, 1.) हस्तप्रच्युता हस्तगत्या Ca. B 1. हस्ते च्युता हस्ते गत्या C. Mill. हस्तच्युता B 4.

P. 906. l. 11. (VII. 1, 13.) अग्रतिविधयात् A., C. Mill, C. Wilson. अग्रति° B. Ca.

P. 907. l. 6. (VII. 1, 15.) A. Ca. B 1. have सेदग्नियो after प्रबोधकं. B 4. places समेद्वारं प्रबोधकं after स्तोताः.

P. 908. l. 6. (VII. 1, 18.) अनवतः B 1. अनववतः A. अनववतः Ca. अनवतः B 4. अनवतः C. Mill.

P. 909. l. 2. (VII. 1, 20.) अथवा B 1. यथा वा A. Ca.; deest in B.

P. 909. l. 3. (VII. 1, 20.) त्वं before त्वपरि° by conjecture. See, however, VII. 3, 10. VII. 7, 7.

P. 909. l. 4. (VII. 1, 20.) अविनाश° B 1. A. Ca. अविनाशि° Yāska.

P. 909. l. 16. (VII. 1, 21.) मोपक्षीयत ॥ नोपक्षीयत A. मापक्षीयतां B 4. मोपक्षीयत Ca., C. Mill. मोपक्षीयते B 1.

P. 909. l. 25. (VII. 1, 22.) निग्रह° C. Mill, B. Ca. विग्रह° A.

P. 910. l. 10. (VII. 1, 23.) क्वास्ते B 4. कास्त A. Ca. B 1.

P. 911. l. 14. (VII. 2, 1.) पञ्चाविष्टाविदं ॥ साविष्टाविदं A. Ca. सोविष्टाविदं B 1.

P. 912. l. 2. (VII. 2, 1.) देशं is left out after समुच्छ्रितं in A. B. C.

P. 912. l. 10. (VII. 2, 2.) सौमिका हविःसंस्थादीनि च C. Mill, C. Wilson. सौमिकानि इतराणि च B 1. सौमिकानि च A. Ca. इतराणि सौमिकानि च B 4.

P. 913. l. 6. (VII. 2, 4.) पादै B 4. पादौ Ca. A. B 1.

P. 914. l. 1. (VII. 2, 6.) दिव्ये दिवि भवे मही मह्यौ from B.

P. 915. l. 2. (VII. 2, 9.) तुरीपं । This is the correct reading instead of तुरीपं, as printed by mistake in III. 4, 9. Devarājyājvan explains तुरीपं by तूर्यं व्याघ्रं शीलमस्य । शिनः । तूर्योपि सत् तुरीपं । उदकमभिधेयं ।

P. 915. l. 17. (VII. 2, 10.) जननानि B 4. जानन् A. B 1. जनाना Ca. जनान् C. Mill, C. Wilson.

P. 916. l. 1. (VII. 2, 11.) अस्माकं ॥ अस्मान् A. B. C.

P. 917. l. 18. (VII. 3, 4.) खादति ॥ सादति A. Ca. सीदति B.

P. 918. l. 2. (VII. 3, 5.) आहवनीयायतने ॥ आहवनीयायते A. आहवनीयायेति Ca. आहवनीये C. Mill. आयतने B 4. आहवनीयातनेये B 1.

P. 919. l. 8. (VII. 3, 8.) रक्षेः ॥ रक्ष A. B. Ca. रक्षाः C. Mill, C. Wilson.

P. 922. l. 7. (VII. 4, 5.) वनिभिश्च ॥ वनिनश्च A. B 1. Ca. वनिनिश्च C. Mill.

P. 922. l. 24. (VII. 4, 7.) परिषदं to धनं from B 4. Ca.; deest in A. B 1.

P. 923. l. 23. (VII. 4, 9.) त्वमु to निपाहि from B 4.

P. 925. l. 2. (VII. 5, 2.) वा before वावृधानः by conjecture.

P. 925. l. 9. (VII. 5, 3.) असितवर्णोः ॥ असिक्त्वर्णोः A. Ca. B.

P. 926. l. 7. (VII. 5, 5.) महान्तं A. B. Ca.; deest in C. Mill.

P. 926. l. 8. (VII. 5, 5.) हरखाद after हतिः A. Ca.; deest in B.

- P. 926<sup>l</sup>. l. 19. (VII. 5, 6.) असेवंत ॥ सेवंत A. B. Ca., C. Mill.  
 P. 927. l. 6. (VII. 5, 7.) कामान् च ॥ कामान्वा A. Ca., C. Mill, B I. कामान् B 4.  
 P. 927. l. 15. (VII. 5, 8.) इषमन्नं C. Mill, B I. इषमन्नमिधं A. Ca.  
 P. 929. l. 8. (VII. 6, 3.) वृषा कालस्य नेतृन् । A. Ca. वृषा कालस्योत्खेप्तृन् B 4.  
 P. 929. l. 9. (VII. 6, 3.) अग्निः to चकार from C. Mill; deest in A. Ca. पूर्वः पुरातनः अग्निः  
 अपरान् पुरुषान् अयज्युन् यागानहान् चकार B 4.  
 P. 930. l. 19. (VII. 6, 7.) आंतरिक्षाणि ॥ अंतरि° A. B. Ca., C. Mill.  
 P. 931. l. 2. (VII. 7, 1.) दश सूक्तेषूक्तो C. Mill. दशसूक्त उक्तो A. Ca. B I.  
 P. 932. l. 7. (VII. 7, 3.) इडायां Ca. इलायां B 4. इज्यां A.; deest in C. Mill.  
 P. 933. l. 12. (VII. 7, 6.) विकल्प्यं C. Mill, B I. विलुप्यं A. Ca.  
 P. 933. l. 14. (VII. 7, 6.) मानुषाणां was most likely a mistake in the original MS. of  
 Sāyana. There is no various reading in any MS., but what Sāyana intended to  
 write was माषाणां ।  
 P. 934. l. 18. (VII. 8, 2.) दीप्तिः B I. दीप्तिः A. B. Ca. दीप्तः C. Mill.  
 P. 941. l. 5. (VII. 10, 5.) सूर्यस्य A. Ca., C. Mill, C. Wilson, B I; left out in B 4.  
 P. 943. l. 3. (VII. 11, 5.) किमर्थमि° ॥ किमित्यत A. Ca., C. Mill, B I.  
 P. 944. l. 11. (VII. 12, 3.) वर्धति from C. Mill.  
 P. 946. l. 6. (VII. 15, 1.) प्रायेण सर्वत्र Ca. A.; lacuna in C. Mill, B.  
 P. 947. l. 6. (VII. 15, 1.) From पावकर्वतौ to स्वस्त्यय° from Ca., C. Mill.  
 P. 947. l. 7. (VII. 15, 1.) भगिनो ॥ भगि Ca. भगा C. Mill.  
 P. 948. l. 24. (VII. 15, 7.) कल्याणस्तोत्रिकं । We should expect कल्याणस्तोत्रकं, and this  
 is the reading of one MS. in VII. 15, 8.  
 P. 949. l. 25. (VII. 15, 11.) नोऽस्म्यं repeated after पाठात् in A. C. Ca. B I; not in B 4.  
 P. 950. l. 2. (VII. 15, 11.) °भगिनी C. Ca. भगी A. भगि B I.  
 P. 952. l. 5. (VII. 16, 2.) वसिष्ठानां B 4. वसिष्ठा A. C. Ca. B I.  
 P. 953. l. 8. (VII. 16, 5.) कामयस्व ॥ कामय त्वं A. B. C. कामय च B I.  
 P. 953. l. 17. (VII. 16, 6.) यः before सुशंसो by conjecture.  
 P. 955. l. 13. (VII. 16, 11.) सोमेन पातं A. Ca. B. सोमपातं B I. उत्तिचध्वं seems to be  
 taken by Sāyana in the sense of सिचध्वं or पूर्यत.  
 P. 955. l. 25. (VII. 17, 1.) सप्तपि C. Mill. सप्तदशापि A. Ca. सदा B I.  
 P. 956. l. 12. (VII. 17, 2.) यज्ञगृहस्य देव्यो वा A. Ca. B I. यज्ञस्य गृहस्य देव्यो च C. यज्ञगृहस्य B.  
 P. 959. l. 22. (VII. 18, 5.) गाथानि तलस्यज्ञानि B.  
 P. 959. l. 23. (VII. 18, 5.) बोधमानं A. B. C. बाधमानं? cf. Rv. I. 100, 18.  
 P. 960. l. 6. (VII. 18, 6.) न तु सन्तः C. न तु समंत अन् A. न तु सतु शंत आशुत Ca. न तु  
 सन्तः B I.  
 P. 960. l. 9. (VII. 18, 6.) निर्यंजिता B. वर्यंजिता A. Ca. अवर्यंजिता B I. इवर्यंजिता C.  
 P. 960. l. 12. (VII. 18, 6.) मत्स्यजनपदा Ca. A. । मत्स्या इव जनपदा B I.  
 P. 960. l. 21. (VII. 18, 7.) तपोभिः अप्रवृद्धा A. Ca. B I. तपोभिः वृद्धा C. तपोभिः प्रवृद्धा B.  
 P. 961. l. 1. (VII. 18, 7.) अजगन् B. C. अजगत् B I. अजगन् अजगत् Ca. अजगन् अजगन् A.

- P. 961. l. 12. (VII. 18, 8.) पालयमानः ॥ पालयमानः A. C. Ca. पलायमानः B 4. पालयमानाः B 1.
- P. 961. l. 19. (VII. 18, 9.) यथापूर्वं B. C. यथापूर्वं A. Ca.
- P. 961. l. 21. (VII. 18, 9.) न्यर्थमगतं B. न्यर्थं आगतं A. C. Ca. न्यर्थं आगतं B 1.
- P. 961. l. 24. (VII. 18, 9.) सुतोक्तान् ॥ सुतोक्तमानान् A. C. Ca. B 1. सुष्ठु अपत्यसंयुक्तान् B 4.
- P. 962. l. 9. (VII. 18, 10.) निमित्तार्थे B 1. निमित्तार्थे A. निमित्तार्थे Ca. निमित्त C.
- P. 962. l. 21. (VII. 18, 11.) युवाध्वर्युरिव etc. ॥ युवाध्वर्युरिव सन्नन् यज्ञगृहे वह्निर्वैस्मिन्नुद्धे शूर etc. A. Ca. B 1. अध्वर्युरिव स यथा सन्नन् यज्ञगृहे वह्निः यस्मिन्नुद्धे शूरः etc. B. यथाध्वर्युरिवा सन्नानि यज्ञगृहे वह्निः यस्मिन्नुद्धे सपत्नान् नि शिशाति नितरां लुनति तस्मिन्नुद्धे शूर etc. C. Mill, C. Wilson.
- P. 964. l. 8. (VII. 18, 15.) बाध्यते B 1. बाधते A. B 4. C. Ca.
- P. 965. l. 5. (VII. 18, 17.) अस्मीन् B. अस्मान् A. C. Ca. B 1.
- P. 965. l. 6. (VII. 18, 17.) वेण्यादेः कृत्यसूच्यै चाकरोद A. वेण्यादेः तस्य सूच्येवाकरोद Ca. वेण्यादेः कृत्यसूच्यै दे वाकरोद C. Mill. वेण्यादैः कृत्यं सूच्यैव करोद B 1.; deest in B 4. यूपदेः कृत्यं?
- P. 965. l. 8. (VII. 18, 17.) धनानि deest in A. B 1.
- P. 965. l. 16. (VII. 18, 18.) विंद । लभ (it would be better to read लभस्व) यो भेदः ॥ विंद लभ स्तुवतः etc. B. वद उभयोरभेदः A. Ca. वा उभयोरभेद C. विद उभयोरभेदः B 1.
- P. 967. l. 6. (VII. 18, 21.) उपगच्छन्ति ॥ उपगच्छन्ति A. C. Ca. अवग° B 1.
- P. 967. l. 13. (VII. 18, 22.) इंद्रं ॥ इंद्रः A. B. Ca. इंद्र C.
- P. 967. l. 16. (VII. 18, 22.) अतद्देवता° ॥ अतस्तद्देवता° A. Ca. अतद्देवता° C. B 1.
- P. 967. l. 22. (VII. 18, 23.) प्रशस्तातिसर्जना अद्वादिदानांगयुक्ताः Ca. A. प्रशस्तातिसर्वजनश्रद्धादिदानांगयुक्ताः C. Mill. प्रशस्तातिसर्जनश्रद्धादिकनामांगयुक्ताः B 1.
- P. 971. l. 12. (VII. 19, 6.) त्वया दत्तानि A. B 1.
- P. 973. l. 3. (VII. 19, 10.) शिवः कल्याणः शूरः B 4.
- P. 973. l. 11. (VII. 19, 11.) ऊना रक्षणेन after शरीरेण B 4.





# VARIETAS LECTIONIS.

## Maṇḍala VII. continued.

Page 3. line 17. (VII. 20, 5.) जन before जनन D. B 1. D. is a fragment of Sáyana's Commentary sent to me by Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall. See preface to the third volume, p. xii.

P. 3. l. 20. (VII. 20, 5.) साधकः B 1.

P. 4. l. 17. (VII. 20, 7.) दूरः A. C. Ca. D. दूरं B.

P. 4. l. 24. (VII. 20, 8.) यः before ते by conjecture.

P. 5. l. 20. (VII. 20, 10.) Sáyana considers वस्त्री सु as one word. In the second explanation Ca. in the margin adds after प्रशस्ता, सु स्तुतिषु.

P. 5. l. 25. (VII. 21, 1.) सूत्रितं च is wanting in A. C. Ca. D. B.

P. 6. l. 21. (VII. 21, 2.) गृहमध्यमग्रावा A. C. Ca. D. गृहः मध्यमध्यमग्रावस्तस्मात् B 4.; deest in B 1. गृहमध्यमग्रा वा D. गृहमध्यमग्रा वा?

P. 7. l. 24. (VII. 21, 5.) उत्सहेत ॥ उत्सहे च A. C. Ca. B 4. D. उत्सहेच्च B 1.

P. 7. l. 25. (VII. 21, 5.) दीव्यन्ति ॥ दीव्यन्ति इति A. C. Ca. B 1. D. दीव्यन्ति इति B 4.

P. 7. l. 25. (VII. 21, 5.) क्रीडन्ति A. Ca. D. क्रीडन्ति C.

P. 8. l. 1. (VII. 21, 5.) अपिगमन् A. B 1. अतिगमन् B. C. Ca. D.

P. 10. l. 24. (VII. 22, 2.) अनुगुणः ॥ गुणः A. B. C. Ca. D.

P. 12. l. 11. (VII. 22, 6.) सवना A. B. सोमस्तोत्रं सादेवना C. Ca. सोमस्तोत्रं सवना D.

P. 12. l. 12. (VII. 22, 6.) ह्यति । स्तौति ॥ स्तौति ह्यति A. स्तौव ह्यति Ca. स्तौता ह्यति आह-यति B 4. स्तौति आहयति D. स्तौति ह्यति B 1.

P. 14. l. 23. (VII. 23, 3.) द्वंद्वानि Ca. A. द्वंद्विनो B 1.

P. 15. l. 15. (VII. 23, 5.) दयसे हि । दयां करोषि B 4.

P. 15. l. 22. (VII. 23, 6.) वज्रकल्पबाहुं ॥ वज्रकल्पनाहं A. C. Ca. D.; not explained in B.

P. 16. l. 12. (VII. 24, 1.) मादयस्व ॥ मादय A. B 4. C. मादाय D. मादय च B 1.

P. 17. l. 1. (VII. 24, 3.) इमं यज्ञं ॥ इदं यज्ञं A. B 4. C. D. इदं यज्ञं B 1.

P. 18. l. 16. (VII. 25, 1.) युद्धार्ये before संगच्छते A. Ca. D.

P. 21. l. 21. (VII. 26, 3.) अन्याप्यन्यानि C. Ca. D. अन्याप्यन्या अन्यानि A. अन्या अन्यानि B.

P. 21. l. 23. (VII. 26, 3.) एकोऽसहायः from B 4.

P. 22. l. 3. (VII. 26, 4.) बाधमानाः A. B 1. बाधनाः B 4. C. Ca. D.

P. 23. l. 2. (VII. 27, 1.) नेमधिता to संग्रामे from B 4. D. has प्रयुज्यते नेमधिता; then, in the margin, नेमधितौ संग्रामे नरः कर्मणां नेतारः इंद्रं हवते आह्वयंतीत्यर्थः. Afterwards the commentary runs on: यमिन्द्रं हवते ह्वयंति स etc.

P. 23. l. 4. (VII. 27, 1.) गोमति गावः संत्यस्मिन्निति गोमत् तस्मिन् Ca. by a later hand, and D. गोमति गोयुक्ते B.

P. 24. l. 14. (VII. 27, 5.) मंहनीयायै ॥ मंहनीयाय MSS. It might be मंहनीयाय दानाय स्तुता-  
ववृत्त्याम ॥

P. 25. l. 20. (VII. 28, 3.) प्रतिष्ठापयसि B 4. ऽपयति A. C. Ca. D. B 1.

P. 26. l. 9. (VII. 28, 4.) तत्प्रसादात् B 4. तत्प्रसादात् A. C. Ca. D. B 1.

P. 27. l. 7. (VII. 29, 1.) सवनीयो C. Ca. सेवनीयो A. तस्सेवनीयो B 4. तत सेवनीयो D.  
सवनायो B 1.

P. 29. l. 17. (VII. 30, 2.) नाम्ना C. Mill. नाम A. B. Ca. D. Possibly it might be मुहंतुना.

P. 29. l. 23. (VII. 30, 3.) यद्यदा च A. B 1. यद्यथा च B 4. C. Ca. D.

P. 29. l. 24. (VII. 30, 3.) तदा ॥ तथा A. तथा B 1. 4. C. Ca. D.

P. 30. l. 24. (VII. 31, 1.) तदर्थः ॥ तदर्थी A. C. Ca. D. तदर्थे B 1.

P. 32. l. 4. (VII. 31, 8.) वशं B. वश A. C. Ca. D.

P. 34. l. 7. (VII. 31, 12.) स्तोत्राणि ॥ स्तोत्राणीं C. Ca. D. स्तोत्राणां A. B 1.

P. 34. l. 22. (VII. 32, 1.) उपसमस्येत् द्विपदां Áśval. उपदस्ये द्विपदां A. स्ये द्विपदां Ca. उपसमस्ये  
द्विपदां D. सद्द्विपदां B 1.

P. 34. l. 23. (VII. 32, 1.) प्रकृतान्तरं etc. is only an explanation of नित्यादूर्ध्वं in Áśval.

P. 34. l. 25. (VII. 32, 1.) मरुत्वतीया ऊर्ध्वं Áśval. मरुत्वतीयादूर्ध्वं A. मरुत्वती ऊर्ध्वं Ca. त्वती  
ऊर्ध्वं C. मरुत्वतीयोर्ध्वं नित्यात्म्या शुभेति च मरुत्वतीये पुरस्तात्सूक्तस्य शंसेत् D. as corrected in the  
margin. मरुत्वतीयादूर्ध्वं B 1.

P. 35. l. 1. (VII. 32, 1.) छावा after नैत्रावरुणशस्त्रे A. C. Ca. D. B.

P. 35. l. 5. (VII. 32, 1.) चारंभणीयाः Áśval. B 1. चारंभणीयां A. C. Ca. D.

P. 35. l. 26. (VII. 32, 1.) अयेने A. C. Ca. D. B 1. यजमानाः अपि B 4., placing so  
before निरीरमन्. It would be better to read त्वां instead of त्वया.

P. 36. l. 23. (VII. 32, 4.) सुना चभूतुः ॥ सुवभू A. Ca.; altogether wanting in C. अभिषु-  
तवंतः B 4. सुवुवः B 1. सुवभूः D., but in the margin अभिषुतवंतः.

P. 39. l. 7. (VII. 32, 10.) आत्मार्षं Ca. C. D. आत्मानं A. B.

P. 40. l. 2. (VII. 32, 12.) सोमानमस्ति B 1. समानमस्ति B 4. D. सोमानमस्ति A. Ca. सोमोपि C.

P. 40. l. 10. (VII. 32, 13.) सुविहितं from C. Ca. D. सुबु निहितं B 4.; deest in B 1.

P. 41. l. 14. (VII. 32, 16.) A. seems to have चांतरिह्यं.

P. 43. l. 21. (VII. 32, 22.) सर्वदृशं not in C. Ca. D.

P. 44. l. 16. (VII. 32, 24.) हविष्यः A. C. Ca. B 1. ह्रातव्यः B 4. यज्ञे वा हव्यः आह्रातव्यः हवि-  
षश्चासि D.

P. 45. l. 14. (VII. 32, 27.) दुराध्यः दुष्टचिन्ताः B 4.

P. 45. l. 15. (VII. 32, 27.) अशिवाः अशिवाः दुराचाराः मा चक्रुः B 4. after मावचक्रुः.

P. 45. l. 19. (VII. 33, 1.) सपुत्रस्य Anukr. सपुत्रेस्ये C. Ca. pr. man. सपुत्रेण A. and Ca. sec. man. सपुत्र सेंद्रेण B 1. सपुत्रेणेंद्रेण D.

P. 45. l. 22. (VII. 33, 1.) न्यायात् A. B 1. नायात् Ca. परिभाषात् C. परिभाषायात् D.

P. 46. l. 4. (VII. 33, 1.) कपर्दीः चूडा B. कपर्दी चूडा A. C. Ca. D. B 1.

P. 46. l. 8. (VII. 33, 1.) नर्हति B 4. अर्हति A. Ca. D. B 1.

P. 46. l. 19. (VII. 33, 1.) पल्लं A. D. पल्लं Ca. B 1.

P. 47. l. 3. (VII. 33, 3.) सवाख्ये B 4. संसवाख्ये B 1. ाख्ये D. संवाख्ये A. Ca.

P. 49. l. 9. (VII. 33, 8.) The text is printed from Ca., including all corrections and marginal additions. The same text is found in D. A. has हे वसिष्ठा एषां वो युष्माकं स्तोमोऽपि वातस्येव. So has B 1., where, however, the words from the beginning to वा are put twice. B 4. agrees with A., but has at the end किंच युष्माकं वक्ष्यः तेजः सूर्यस्येव सूर्यज्योतिरिव । तथा युष्माकं महिमा समुद्रस्येव गभीरः गंभीरः इव ॥ C. has the same as Ca., only ऽपि वा after the first स्तोमो. MS. E. I. H. 2612. marks a lacuna after हे वसिष्ठा वो युष्माकं स्तोमोऽपि वा - - - - to हे वसिष्ठाः एषां वो युष्माकं स्तोमोऽपि वा.

P. 49. l. 18. (VII. 33, 9.) कारणात्मना B. D. कारणानात्मना A. C. Ca.: cf. verse 12.

P. 50. l. 16. (VII. 33, 11.) मनसो and afterwards अथि from B 4.

P. 50. l. 20. (VII. 33, 11.) अहंभुवा B 1. A. B. Ca. D. अहंभुवा MS. E. I. H. 2612. स्वयंभुवा?

P. 50. l. 23. (VII. 33, 11.) संभूत A. सभूत C. Ca. संबभूव Bṛihaddev. as quoted in Böhrlingk and Roth's Dict. under अगस्त्य.

P. 50. l. 25. (VII. 33, 11.) The Sloka beginning with यद्वा कुंभात् exists only in A. D. B 1. हि मीयते A. B. D. महीयते Bṛihaddev. l. c. No MS. has वासतीचरे, as Roth reads. मार्णं च D.

P. 53. l. 13. (VII. 34, 4.) पूर्वस्याभिद्रुस्य ॥ पूर्वस्यानि A. C. Ca. D. पूर्वस्यापि B 1.

P. 56. l. 8. (VII. 34, 16.) सीदंतं B 1. 4. सीदंत A. C. Ca. D.

P. 56. l. 16. (VII. 34, 17.) न क्षीयेत Ca. sec. man. न दीयेत A. and Ca. pr. man. न क्षीयेत B 1. न होयेत C. न दीयेत A. न क्षीयेत् D.

P. 58. l. 18. (VII. 34, 24.) जिहीतां ॥ जिहातां A. Ca. D. B 1. जिहातु B 4.

P. 58. l. 20. (VII. 34, 24.) भरणीयां ॥ भरणीयां A. C. Ca. D. भरणीयं B 1. 4.

P. 59. l. 8. (VII. 35, 1.) The lacuna at the end of the Vinīyoga is marked in A. C. Ca., and supplied in Ca. by a later hand, एव(नेता)सु. D. marks no lacuna, but has एवमेतासु. B 1. has एव तमुक्तसु 1.

P. 61. l. 3. (VII. 35, 5.) After पूर्वहूतौ a lacuna is marked in A. Ca. पूं प्रथमाह्वाने B 4. पूं पूर्वं प्रार्थितौ C. प्रथमाह्वानौ Ca. sec. man. and D. पूं भवतां B 1.

P. 61. l. 15. (VII. 35, 6.) जलापः. No explanation is given in A. गंगाधरः B 4. C. Ca. mark a lacuna after जलापः, which is supplied by सुखरूपः in Ca. sec. man. and D. B 1. has जलापा - - रुद्रो.

P. 65. l. 4. (VII. 35, 15.) S. 2. gives at the end of the third Adhyāya a Khila. In S. 1. it is put at the beginning of the hymn (end of 27th Varga). It is not in S. 3., nor in the text inserted in A. Colebrooke.

श्रवतीः पारयन्ते<sup>a</sup> तं पृच्छन्ति वचो युजा ।  
 अभ्यारं तं<sup>b</sup> यमाकेतुं य एवेदमिति ब्रवत् ॥ १ ॥  
 भासाकेतुं परिस्तुतं<sup>c</sup> भारतीर्ब्रह्मवर्धनीः ।  
 संजानाना मही माता य एवेदमिति ब्रवत् ॥ २ ॥  
 इन्द्रस्तं किं विभुं प्रभुं भानुनेयं सरस्वती ।  
 येन सूर्यमरोचयद्येनेमे रोदसी उभे ॥ ३ ॥  
 जुषस्वाग्ने अंगिरः कारुणं मेध्यातिथिं ।  
 मा त्वा सोमस्य बर्हत्सुतस्य मधुमत्तमः ॥ ४ ॥<sup>d</sup>  
 आ शतम शतमाभिरभिष्टिभिः ।  
 शान्तिं स्वस्तिमकुर्वत ॥ ५ ॥  
 शं नः कर्निक्रदद्देवः पर्जन्यो अभिवर्धतु ।  
 शं नो द्यावापृथिवी शं प्रजाभ्यः शं न एधि द्विपदे शं चतुष्पदे ॥ ६ ॥

I take this opportunity of publishing some additional Khilas belonging to the preceding Maṇḍalas. They were sent to me by Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall, to whose kindness I am already so much indebted. There is one complete collection of the Pariśiṣṭas of the Rīg-veda. It begins श्रीगणेशाय नमः ॥ प्रथमाष्टके शून्य ॥ द्वितीयाष्टके पंचमाध्याये मंडलांते ॥ मा विभर्ते etc. It ends शं नो अस्तु द्विपदे शं चतुष्पदे ॥ १ ॥ इति परिशिष्टानि संपूर्णानि ॥ ॥ संवत् १९१५ माघे मासे द्वादश्यां इंदुवासरे तद्दिने संपूर्ण ॥ This I shall quote as P. S.

At the end of the first Maṇḍala, after the six stanzas beginning with मा विभर्ते and ending with शिशवृक्षफलं यथा, P. S. adds:

यो जगत्कारुणाज्जातो जगत्कर्मां महायंशाः । तस्य सर्पाय भद्रं ते भूमिं गच्छ महायंशाः ॥  
 असितिं चार्थसिद्धिं च सुनीतिं चापि यः स्मरेत् । दिवा वा यदि वा रात्रौ नास्ति सर्पभयं हरेत् ॥  
 अगस्तिर्माधवश्चैव मुचुकुन्दो महामुनिः । कपिलो मुनिरास्तीकः पंचैते सुखशायिनः ॥  
 नर्मदायै नमः प्रातर्नर्मदायै नमो निशि । नमोऽस्तु नर्मदे तुभ्यं त्राहि मां विषसर्पतः ॥

Another MS. gives the same lines with the following variations:

यो जगत्कारुणाज् जातो जगत्कर्मां महायंशाः ।  
 तस्य सर्पाऽभि भद्रं ते दूरं गच्छ महायंशाः ॥  
 असितिं चार्थसिद्धिं च सुनीतिं चापि यः स्मरेत् ।  
 दिवा वा यदि वा रात्रौ नास्ति सर्पभयं भवेत् ॥  
 अगस्तिर्माधवश्चैव मुचुकुन्दो महामुनिः ।  
 कपिलो मुनिरास्तीकः पंचैते सुखशायिनः ॥

<sup>a</sup> यन्तेदे P. S.

<sup>b</sup> अभ्यारं सं S. I.

<sup>c</sup> पुरुसृहं S. I. P. S.

<sup>d</sup> त्वमग्ने अंगिरः

नर्मदायै नमुस्तुभ्यं नर्मदायै नमो निशि ।

नमोऽस्तु नर्मदे तुभ्यं त्राहि मां विषसूतः ॥

These lines correspond to Mahābhārata I. 2188, 2189.

The only various readings of any importance in the first six stanzas are, verse 2. विष्णोर्वाहुः; verse 5. महायशः instead of महाविषाः. The accents too are given differently, but by no means correctly.

At the end of the second Maṇḍala, P. S. gives the Khila भद्रं वद without repeating the last verse आचदंस्त्वं from the Vedic hymn. It adds the accents, but not correctly. The only various reading of importance is in verse 2. भद्रमस्माकं नो.

At the end of V. 44, P. S. has the Khila जगधि, as printed.

At the end of V. 49, P. S. gives the following Khila:

सूक्तानि नृणाम्यग्नावरक्ष्ये वोदकेऽपि वा । यत्सूर्यैरध्ययनं<sup>a</sup> तदधीनं सृणानि भवते भव ॥

वार्पिकूपतडागानां समुद्रं गच्छ स्वाहृनिं गच्छ स्वाहा ॥ Cf. Khila at the end of VI. 48.

At the end of V. 51, P. S. gives the Khila स्वस्त्ययनं, as printed.

At the end of V. 84, P. S. gives the Khila चर्षतु, as printed.

At the end of the 5th Maṇḍala, P. S. gives the Śrīsūkta. As Dr. Hall has been so fortunate as to discover a commentary on this Khila, I reprint the same, together with some valuable notes of his, published in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. XXVIII. p. 121.

श्रीसूक्तम् ।

हिरण्यवर्णी हिरणीं सुवर्णैरजतस्रजाम् ।

चन्द्रां हिरण्यमयीं लक्ष्मीं जातवेदो म आ वह<sup>b</sup> ॥ १ ॥

अस्यार्थः । हे जातवेदः । जानाति वेदं । जातप्रज्ञो वा । जाते जाते विद्यत इति वा । हे अग्ने त्वं हिरण्यवर्णी हिरण्यस्य सुवर्णस्य वर्णीः कानिस्तद्वर्णी यस्यास्ताम् । हिरणीं हरितवर्णीम् । हिरणीरूपधरां वा ।

श्रीधृत्वा हिरणीरूपमरक्ष्ये सञ्चचार ह ।

इति देवीपुराणाच्च । सुवर्णैरजतस्रजां सुवर्णस्य रजतस्य च पुष्पाणि सुवर्णीनि रजतानि तेषां स्रक् माला यस्यास्ताम् । स्रक्साहचर्यात् पुष्पाणीत्यवगम्यते । पुष्पसादृश्यात् पुष्पे फले लुक् । आपं चैव हलन्तानामित्याप् । यद्वा सुवर्णैरजतविकृतशृङ्खलाम् । सुभु वर्णी यस्य तत्सुवर्णी यद्वरजतं तत्पुष्पस्रजाम्<sup>c</sup> । तद्विकृतशृङ्खलां वा । चन्द्रां चन्द्रवत्प्रकाशमानाम् । तद्रूपेणावस्थितां वा । हिरण्यमयीं हिरण्यस्वरूपाम् । हिरण्यविग्रहां वा । लक्ष्मीं लक्षणवतीम् । लक्ष्मीर्लाभाद्वा लक्षणाद्वेत्यादिनिरुक्ता । [नैगमकारे ४. १०.] एवंरूपां श्रियं मे मह्यं मदर्थमावह । आह्वय । अग्नेर्देवहोतृत्वादाह्वानं तदधीनमिति भावः । अग्निर्देवं देवानां होतेति श्रुतेः ॥ १ ॥

तां म आ वह जातवेदो लक्ष्मीमनपगायिनीम्<sup>d</sup> ।

यस्यां हिरण्यं विन्देयं गामयं पुरुषानहम् ॥ २ ॥

अस्यार्थः । हे जातवेदः अग्ने त्वमनपगायिनीमपगमनरहितामनपायिनीमित्यर्थः । तां वक्ष्यमाणलक्षणां लक्ष्मीं मे

<sup>a</sup> यस्तु<sup>o</sup> other MS.

<sup>b</sup> म आ वह P. S.

<sup>c</sup> Something wanting in this sentence.

<sup>d</sup> मलय P. S.

मन्त्रमावह । आह्वय । यस्यां श्रीदेव्यामावाहितायां सत्यां हिरण्यं सुवर्णं गां धेनुमश्च वाजिनं पुरुषान् पुत्रपौत्रमित्रदास-  
भूतानहं विन्देयं प्राप्नुयाम् ॥२॥

अश्वपूर्वा<sup>a</sup> रथमध्यां हस्तिनादप्रबोधिनीम्<sup>b</sup> ।

अथ्यं देवीमुपह्वये श्रीर्मा देवी जुषताम्<sup>c</sup> ॥३॥

अस्यार्थः । अश्वपूर्वामश्याः पूर्वं पुरोगा यस्यास्ताम् । अथवाऽश्वपूर्वामश्वैः पूर्णां परिपूर्णीमिति केचित् । रथमध्यां  
रथा मध्ये यस्यास्ताम् । हस्तिनादप्रबोधिनीं हस्तिनां गजानां नादेन बृंहितेन प्रबोधिनीं प्रकर्षेण ज्ञापयित्रीम् । देवीं  
देवनशीलाम् । द्योतनशीलां वा । अथ्यं अयणीयाम् । सेनारूपां वा । उपह्वये<sup>e</sup> समीपं प्रत्याह्वये । एतादृशीं देवी श्रीर्मा  
मां जुषतां सेवताम् ॥३॥

कां सोस्मितां हिरण्यप्राकारामाद्रीं ज्वलन्तीं तृप्तां तर्पयन्तीम् ।

पद्मे स्थितां पद्मवर्णीं तामिहोपह्वये अथ्यम् ॥४॥

अस्यार्थः । कां वाङ्मनसयोरगोचरां दुर्निरूपस्वरूपामित्यर्थः । ब्रह्मरूपां वा । को ह वै नाम प्रजापतिरिति श्रुत्यन्त-  
रात् । क इति ब्रह्मणो नामेति पुराणाच्च । सोस्मितां । आ ईषदासमनादुद्गतं यत् स्मितं हास्यं तद्युक्ताम् । उपान्यलो-  
पश्चान्दसः । हिरण्यप्राकारां हिरण्यस्य सुवर्णस्य प्राकार आकरणं यस्यास्ताम् । हिरण्यमृकृष्ट आकार आकृतिर्यस्या-  
स्तामिति वा । आद्रीं क्लिप्तां क्षीरोदधेरुत्पन्नत्वात् । रुद्ररूपां वा । रुद्रशब्दोऽत्रामूर्धन्यस्वरुदिः । आद्रीया रुद्र इत्यादौ  
तथा दर्शनात् । अन्यद् बाहुलकम् । ज्वलन्तीं प्रकाशमानाम् । तृप्तां प्रीतामपि च तर्पयन्तीं भक्तान् मनोरथैरिति शेषः ।  
पद्मे स्थितां कमले निषण्णामासीनाम् । पद्मवर्णीं कमलवर्णीम् । तामिति प्रसिद्धां अथ्यमिहोपह्वये समीपं प्रत्याह्वये ॥४॥

चन्द्रां प्रभासां यशसा ज्वलन्तीं अथ्यं लोके देवजुष्टामुदाराम् ।

तां पद्मिनीमी<sup>d</sup> शरणं प्रपद्येऽलक्ष्मीमे<sup>e</sup> नश्यतां त्वां वृणोमि<sup>f</sup> ॥५॥

अस्यार्थः । अत्र प्रपद्य इत्यस्यानन्तरमहंशब्दप्रक्षेपः प्रामादिकः । चन्द्रां चन्द्रवत् प्रकाशमानाम् । प्रभासां प्रकृष्टा भाः  
कान्तिर्यस्यास्ताम् । आपां चैवेत्याप् । यशसा कीर्त्या ज्वलन्तीं प्रकाशमानाम् । लोके स्वलोके देवजुष्टां देवैरिन्द्राद्यैर्जुष्टां  
सेविताम् । प्रीतां वा । उदारां वदान्याम् प्रगल्भां वा । पद्मिनीं पद्मलतारूपाम् । पद्माकारां वा । ईमिति निपा-  
तोऽनर्थकः । मिताक्षरेष्वनर्थकाः कमीमिद्विति यास्कवचनात् । [नैगमकाण्डे १०. ९.] ईकारवाच्यां वा । तां अथ्यं लोक  
इह लोके शरणं रक्षित्रीं प्रपद्ये प्रपद्योऽस्मि । अहमिति शेषः । अतो हे श्रीः मे ममालक्ष्मीरश्रीर्नश्यतां नाशं प्राप्नुतु ।  
एतादृशीं त्वां वृणोमि । अन्तर्भावितस्त्येषात् । वृणे शरणत्वेन स्वीकुर्वे ॥५॥ वर्गः १ ॥

आदित्यवर्णं तपसोऽधि जातो वनस्पतिस्तव वृक्षोऽथ बिल्वः ।

तस्य फलानि तपसा नुदन्तु मा या अन्तरा<sup>g</sup> याश्च बाह्या अलक्ष्मीः ॥६॥

वृक्षोऽथेत्यतः परमपि पूर्वरूपं बाहुलकात् । आदित्यवर्णे आदित्यस्य सूर्यस्य वर्णे इव वर्णे यस्यास्तस्याः सङ्गोधनं हे  
श्रीस्तव तपसः नियमाद्धेतोर्वनस्पतिः ।

अपुष्पाः फलवन्तो ये ते वनस्पतयः स्मृताः ।

इति मानवस्मरणात् [१. ४९.] । बिल्वः बिल्वनामको वृक्षो दुग्धोऽधिजातः प्रादुर्भूतः । त्वत्करादिति शेषः ।  
कात्यायनः ।

बिल्वो लक्ष्म्याः करेऽभवत् ।

इति वामनपुराणात् । अथेत्यनन्तरं तस्य बिल्वस्य फलानि पक्वानि शलादुकानि तपसा त्वत्तपसा त्वदनुग्रहेणेत्यर्थः ।

<sup>a</sup> पूर्वा P. S.

<sup>b</sup> बोधिनीम् P. S.

<sup>c</sup> देवीर्जुः P. S.

<sup>d</sup> पद्मनेमी P. S.

<sup>e</sup> शरणमहं प्रं P. S.

<sup>f</sup> त्वां वृणे P. S.

<sup>g</sup> यांतरा P. S.

अनतरा अनरिन्द्रियसङ्गन्धिन्यो याश्च बाह्या बहिरिन्द्रियसङ्गन्धिन्यस्ता अलक्ष्मीरश्रियो नुदन्तु अपनुदन्तु निवार-  
यन्तिवत्यर्थः ॥ ६ ॥

उपैतु मां देवसखः कीर्तिश्च मणिना सह ।

प्रादुर्भूतोऽस्मि<sup>a</sup> राष्ट्रेऽस्मिन् कीर्तिमृद्धिं ददातु मे ॥ ७ ॥

अस्यार्थः । हे श्रीः देवसखः देवो महादेवस्तस्य सखा कुबेरः । कीर्तिश्च कीर्त्यभिमानिनी दक्षकन्या देवता । कुबेर-  
कोशशाला वा । सा च मणिना चिनामणिना मणिभद्रेण कोशाध्यक्षेण सह सार्धमुपैतु उपगच्छतु । अहमस्मिन् राष्ट्रे  
जनपदे प्रादुर्भूतोऽस्मि । उत्पन्नोऽस्मि । सङ्गत्य कीर्तिं यशः कोशं वा चृद्धिं सर्ववस्तुसमृद्धिं मे मम ददातु यच्छतु ॥ ७ ॥

क्षुत्पिपासामलां<sup>b</sup> ज्येष्ठामलक्ष्मीं<sup>c</sup> नाशयाम्यहम् ।

अभूतिमसमृद्धिं च सर्वै<sup>d</sup> निर्णुद मे गृहात् ॥ ८ ॥

अस्यार्थः । क्षुत्पिपासामलामशनतृष्णामलिनात्मिकाम् । ज्येष्ठां वृद्धां श्रीप्रागुत्पन्नामित्यर्थः । अलक्ष्मीमश्रियमहं नाश-  
यामि नाशं प्रापयामि । हे श्रीस्त्वमभूतिमसम्पत्तिं तथा सर्वामसमृद्धिमनभिवृद्धिं मे मम गृहात् गेहात् निर्णुद  
निवारय ॥ ८ ॥

गन्धद्वारां दुराधर्षा नित्यपुष्टां करीषिणीम् ।

ईश्वरीं सर्वभूतानां तामिहोपह्वये श्रियम् ॥ ९ ॥

अस्यार्थः । गन्धो घ्राणग्राह्यो गुणो द्वारं लक्ष्यं यस्यास्ताम् । दुराधर्षा केनापि धर्वयितुमशक्याम् । नित्यपुष्टां नित्यं  
निरन्तरं सस्यादिभिः पुष्टां समृद्धाम् । करीषिणीं करीषः शुष्कगोमयादिस्तद्वर्ता गवाश्चादिवहुपशुसमृद्धामिति यावत् ।  
सर्वभूतानां सर्वप्राणिनामीश्वरीमधिष्ठात्रीम् । आधारभूतां वा । तां भूरूपां श्रियमिह लोक उपह्वये उपाह्वये समीपं  
प्रत्याह्वये ॥ ९ ॥

मनसः काममाकूतिं वाचः सत्यमशीमहि ।

पशूनां रूपमन्नस्य मयि श्रीः श्रयतां यशः ॥ १० ॥<sup>e</sup>

अस्यार्थः । हे श्रीः मनसः कामं मनोऽभिलाषम् । आकूतिं सङ्कल्पं च । वाचः वागिन्द्रियस्य सत्यं याचार्थम् । पशूनां  
गोमहिष्वादीनां रूपं क्षीरादि । अन्नस्य । अन्नोत्पन्नं । तस्यादनीयस्य यवव्रीहादे रूपं भक्ष्यादिचतुर्विधं चाशीमहि लभेमहि ।  
श्रीः सम्पत्तिः यशः कीर्तिश्च मयि श्रयतां । आश्रयताम् ॥ १० ॥ वगीः २ ॥

कर्दमेन प्रज्ञा भूता मयि सम्भव कर्दम ।

श्रियं वासय मे कुले मातरं पद्ममालिनीम् ॥ ११ ॥

अस्यार्थः । कर्दमेन कर्दमाख्येन पुत्रेण प्रकृष्टा जा अपत्यं यस्याः सा सुपुत्रेत्यर्थः । जामपत्यमिति यास्कवचनात् ।  
[नैगमकाख्ये ३. ६.] भूता । अभवत् । अतः हे कर्दम श्रीपुत्र त्वं मयि मदीयगृहे सम्भव संवस । पद्ममालिनीं कमलमाला-  
धारिणीं मातरं तव जननीं श्रियं मे मम कुले वंशे वासय निवासय ॥ ११ ॥

आपः सृजन्तु स्निग्धानि चिह्नानि वस मे गृहे ।

नि च<sup>f</sup> देवीं मातरं श्रियं वासय मे कुले ॥ १२ ॥

अस्यार्थः । आपः जलाभिमानिन्यो देवताः । स्निग्धानि स्नेहयुक्तानि कार्याणि सृजन्तु । उत्पादयन्तु । अपां स्नेहगुण-  
वस्त्रादिति भावः । हे चिह्नानि चिह्नोत्पादय श्रीपुत्र मे मम गृहे गेहे वस निवस । च अपि च देवीं मातरं श्रियं मे मम  
कुले वंशे निवासय संवासय ॥ १२ ॥

<sup>a</sup> प्रादुर्भूतोऽस्मि P. S.

<sup>b</sup> ला P. S.

<sup>c</sup> हा P. S. , क्षीनी P. S.

<sup>d</sup> वा P. S.

<sup>e</sup> Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā XXXIX. 4.

<sup>f</sup> नो च P. S.



आर्द्रा पुष्करिणीं पुष्टिं<sup>a</sup> पिङ्गलां पद्ममालिनीम् ।

चन्द्रां हिरण्यमीं लक्ष्मीं जातवेदो म आ वह ॥ १३ ॥

अस्यार्थः । आर्द्रामार्द्राङ्गाम् । पुष्करिणीमभिषेकोद्युक्तां दिग्गजशुण्डयेति भावः । पुष्करशब्दो गजशुण्डाग्रवाचकः । पद्ममालिनीं पद्मवतीम् । पद्मलतारूपां वा । पुष्टिं पुष्ट्यभिमानिनीम् । पुष्टिरूपां वा । पुष्टिरूपेण संस्थितेति मार्कण्डेयवचनात् । पिङ्गलां पिङ्गलवर्णाम् । पद्ममालिनीमित्यादि सिद्धमन्यत् ॥ १३ ॥

आर्द्रा यःकरिणीं यष्टिं<sup>b</sup> सुवर्णीं हेममालिनीम् ।

सूर्यां हिरण्यमीं लक्ष्मीं जातवेदो म आ वह ॥ १४ ॥

अस्यार्थः । आर्द्रामार्द्राङ्गाम् । यः करिणीं यष्टिकरां वेतहस्तामित्यर्थः । टिलोपशब्दान्दसः । तद्वतीं दण्डकारिणीं वा । दण्डकरां वा । यष्टिं दण्डरूपाम् । सुवर्णीं शोभनवर्णाम् । हेममालिनीं हेमविकृतमणिशृङ्खलादिमालावतीम् । सूर्यां सूर्यवत् प्रकाशमानाम् । तदूपां वा । सिद्धमन्यत् ॥ १४ ॥

तां म आ वह जातवेदो लक्ष्मीमनपगामिनीम्<sup>c</sup> ।

यस्यां हिरण्यं प्रभूतं गावो दास्योऽश्वान् निन्देयं पुरुषानहम् ॥ १५ ॥

अस्यार्थः । प्रभूतं भूयिष्ठम् । गावः गाः । दास्यः परिचारिकाः । उभयतः शस् । इयमृक् द्वितीयया कृचा व्याख्याता । अर्थ इयान् विशेषः ॥ १५ ॥ वर्गः ३ ॥

इति श्रीसूक्तभाष्यं समाप्तम् ।

The following various readings in the fourteen verses which stand at the end of the Śrīśūkta have been gleaned from Dr. Hall's edition and from the P. S.:

Verse 16, as numbered in my preface, सूक्ते instead of अत्रयः H.

— 17. पद्मजरु H. जरु P. S. पद्मसंभवेत् P. S. यन्मे P. S. पद्माक्षी P. S.

— 18. °दायै three times, as in S. 2., P. S. लभतां देवि H.

— 20. धनमश्विना P. S.

— 21. मसं H. मसं P. S. instead of मघं.

— 22. मात्सर्पे H. P. S.

— 23. धवलतरा H. मात्सर्पेणो P. S.

— 24. stands as v. 28 in H. P. S. माविधाच् शुभमानं H. माविधात्पवमानं P. S. धान्यं धनं P. S.

— 25. stands as v. 26 in H. P. S. पद्मालये instead of पद्मप्रिये. °यताक्षी P. S. हृदि for मयि H. P. S.

— 26. stands as v. 24 in H. P. S. विष्णोः instead of लक्ष्मीं P. S.

— 27. stands as v. 25 in H. P. S. तन्नो लक्ष्मीः H. P. S.

— 28. stands as v. 27 in H. P. S., where a second line is supplied, कृषयः अत्रयपुत्राश्च श्रीर्देवीर्देवता H.; to this P. S. adds at the end अत्रया. In the first line H. reads आनन्दं, P. S. आनन्दः; P. S. श्रीत for श्रीद; both विष्णुताः for विष्णुतः.

— 29. दारिद्र्यं H. P. S. भयः शोक P. S. After नश्यंतु, मम H. P. S.

<sup>a</sup> ह्रीं P. S.

<sup>b</sup> यष्टीं P. S.

<sup>c</sup> लप° P. S.

The commentary on the *Śrísūkta*, published by Dr. Hall, is ascribed to Vidyādhara, to Vidyā Tīrtha Maheśvara, and to Vidyāranya Svāmin. Dr. Hall adds the following extracts and remarks, which bear on the character of this peculiar hymn :

“I here extract a part of Govinda Śāstrī's commentary on the forty-fifth couplet of the *Ātharvāṇa-rahasya* : काशीखण्डे लक्ष्मीस्तव आचर्यैणलक्ष्मीसूक्तश्रुतमन्त्रवर्णा उपवृंहिताः ।

अस्य

त्वं श्रीरुपेन्द्रतदने मदनैकमातर  
ज्योत्स्नाऽसि चन्द्रमसि चन्द्रमनोहरास्ये ।  
सूर्ये प्रभा सितजगन्वितये प्रभासि  
लक्ष्मी प्रसीद सततं नमतां शरण्ये ॥  
त्वं जातवेदसि सदा दहनात्मशक्ति  
वेधास्त्वया जगदिदं विविधं विदध्यात् ।  
विश्वम्भरोऽपि बिभृयादखिलं भवत्या  
लक्ष्मी प्रसीद सततं नमतां शरण्ये ॥

इत्यादिना शब्दसारूप्यादर्थाविरोधाच्च काशीखण्ड उपवृंहणं द्रष्टव्यम् । नन्वथर्वसंहितायां श्रीसूक्तादर्शनाच्छ्रीसूक्तमथर्वणो नास्तीति चेन्न । समशतीव्याख्यादिषु श्रीसूक्तमथर्वणप्रसिद्धमिति शिष्टोक्तेरुच्छिन्नशाखासु तत्कल्पनस्यैवौचित्यात् । अत एव लक्ष्मीसूक्तनिरुक्ते ।

वैनतेय सोमं पिब सोमं पिबतु वृत्रहा ।  
सोमं धनस्य सोमिनो मह्यं ददातु सोमिनः ॥

इति मन्त्रव्याख्याने । यतः सर्वे देवा धनरूपा उक्तास्तस्मात् तेनैव धनेन श्रौतस्मार्तकर्मोद्यनुष्ठाना अभिभवन्ति । तदेवाभियज्ञगाथा गीयते । इत्युपक्रम्य वैनतेय विनतायाः पुत्रं गरुत्मस्वमसमाभिः कृतं सोमं सोमरसं पिब पानं कुरु । वृत्रहेन्द्र सोमं पिबतु सोमपानं करोतु । सोमिनो यागकर्तारः सोमसमृन्धिनो चृत्विजः सोमं पिबन्तु सोमपानं कुर्वन्तु । सोमिनो यज्ञसमृन्धिनो देवताश्च मह्यं यज्ञफलं धनाद्यभिवृद्धिं च ददातु दिशन्तु । इतोदं व्याख्यानमग्निसन्निधौ जपवा सर्वान् कामानवाप्नोत्यनेनाग्निसन्निधौ तज्जपप्राशस्त्यं दर्शितम् । वैदिकाभावे प्रयोजनमनुद्दिश्येति न्यायेन तज्जपफलप्रदर्शनस्योन्मत्तप्रलाप इवाप्रामाण्यापत्तेः । श्रीसूक्तविशेषस्तु मेरुतन्त्रे व्यक्त इत्यन्यत्र विसरः ।

“A passage is given, first of all, professedly from the *Lakshmi-stava* of the *Kāśī-khaṇḍa*. It runs thus: ‘Unrivalled mother of Madana, *abiding* in the mansion of Upendra, thou *art* Śrī. With countenance delightful to the mind as is the moon, to the moon thou art lustre, *and* radiance to the sun. Effulgent art thou throughout the bright triple world. Constantly be thou benignant, O Lakshmi, protectress, to *thy* adorers. Ever art thou the intrinsic combusive energy of fire. Vedhas, through thy agency, created this multiform universe. Viśwambhara also, by means of thee, has upheld *it* all. Constantly be thou benignant, O Lakshmi, protectress, to *thy* adorers.’ This, urges Govinda, on the argument of verbal similarity and indiscrepancy of import, is paraphrased from the *Śrī-sūkta* of the *Ātharvāṇa-veda*. Some nameless scholiast of the *Sapta satī* is next alleged to have spoken of ‘the *Śrī-sūkta*’ as notoriously *Ātharvāṇa*. From the *Lakshmi sūkta nirukta* a couplet is then adduced, with its explanation :

and it should thus seem—as will be seen in the further progress of this paper—that not only the *S'ri-sūkta*, but its appendix as well, has enjoyed an exposition other than that which I now print. Govinda tells us, in fine, that somewhere else it is shown at length that the *S'ri-sūkta* is the theme of a detailed account in the *Meru-tantra*. All this is abundantly flaccid and unsatisfying.

“The first book of the *Vishnu-purāṇa*, ninth chapter, has these words, in the narration of the churning of the ocean :

ततः स्फुरत्कान्तिमति विकसिकमले स्थिता ।

श्रीदेवी यस्यस्तस्मादुत्थिता धृतपङ्कजा ॥९९॥

तां तुष्टुवुर्मुदा युक्ताः श्रीसूक्तेन महर्षयः ।

“Subsequently, seated on an expanded lotus beaming with brilliancy, the goddess Śrī, bearing a lotus, emerged from that *sea of milk*. Joyfully did the great sages laud her with the *S'ri-sūkta*.”

“According to the commentator, who repeats its commencement, that hymn was the very one with which we are concerned. No one can know more about the matter than he knew : and he can have known nothing.

“Another melody addressed to Śrī, but claiming Indra for its author, will be found in the same chapter of the *Vishnu-purāṇa* that has just been quoted from, beginning with the hundred and sixteenth stanza, and ending with the hundred and thirty-first.

“Still another set of verses, eulogistic of Lakshmī, extending to only seven couplets, is cited, agreeably to one version, in the *Dāna-kamalākara* and elsewhere. Colebrooke has translated them in his *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I., pp. 179 and 180. Here is the first of them :

या लक्ष्मीः सर्वदेवानां या च देवेष्ववस्थिता ।

धेनुरूपेण सा देवी मम शान्तिं प्रयच्छतु ॥

“But of much more customary occurrence than any of the before mentioned poems is the *Lakshmī-hrīdaya-stotra*, in one hundred and six stanzas. It purports, in its colophon, to be derived from the *Uttara-kāṇḍa* of the *Atharva-rahasya*, whatever that work may be. The introductory lines are subjoined :

वन्दे लक्ष्मीं परशिवमयीं शुद्धजाम्बूनदाम्निं

तेजोरूपां कनकवसनां सर्वभूयोज्ज्वलाङ्गिणीं ।

बीजापूरं कनककलशं हेमपद्मं दधानां

आद्याशक्तिं सकलजननीं विष्णुवामाङ्कसंस्थाम् ॥

“To Lakshmī—identical with supreme prosperity; lustrous as pure gold; splendour incorporate; of apparel like gold; whose person glitters with all manner of embellishments; bearing a citron, a golden vase, and an aureate lotus; the primæval energy; the universal genitrix; reposing on the left thigh of Vishnu—I make obeisance.”

Instead of the three verses at the end of the Khila which follows the *Sṛisūkta*, printed pp. xlii and xliii of the preface to the third volume, one MS. at Saugor has the following four lines:

वासनाद् वासुदेवोऽसि वासितं ते जगन्नयम् ।  
सर्वभूतनिवासोऽसि वासुदेव नमोऽस्तु ते ॥  
दश सप्त च नामानि मण्डलान्तेषु यः पठेत् ।  
स शिवस्य पदं गत्वा शिवलोके महीयते ॥

At the end of VI. 44, P. S. gives the Khila as printed on page xlix of my preface to the third volume. It omits, however, the third verse, and inverts the order of vv. 1 and 2. It reads नखश्च instead of उरश्च ।

P. 66. l. 4. (VII. 36, 1.) नात्यस्य चित् ॥ नात्यस्य कस्य चित् ?

P. 67. l. 4. (VII. 36, 3.) अचिक्कदत् शब्दयत् B 4.

P. 67. l. 12. (VII. 36, 4.) युञ्ज्यात् ॥ युञ्जान् A. B 1. युञ्जन् B 4. युञ्जान् Ca. D. युञ्जान C.

P. 70. l. 4. (VII. 37, 1.) तेन रथेन A. C. Ca. B 1. 4.

P. 72. l. 7. (VII. 37, 6.) निवहेत् ॥ न्यवहेत् A. B 1. 4. C. Ca. D.

P. 73. l. 2. (VII. 37, 8.) प्रतिपादिता B 4. प्रतिपादका A. C. Ca. D. B 1.

P. 76. l. 25. (VII. 39, 1.) प्रउगं Áśval. B 1. प्रउग A. C. Ca. D.

P. 78. l. 3. (VII. 39, 3.) पृथिव्यां ॥ पृथिव्यासा A. C. Ca. पृथिव्याः B 4. पृथिव्याः संतरं रमयतां B 1. पृथिव्याः सा D.

P. 78. l. 24. (VII. 39, 5.) गिरीयान् Ca. गरीयान् A. B.; deest in C. गिरीया D.

P. 79. l. 15. (VII. 39, 6.) सखीमहि संगमेमहि B.

P. 79. l. 24. (VII. 39, 7.) चंद्रा आह्लादका सर्वे यूयं etc. A. B 1. °रभिष्टुता आसन् सूक्ते प्रतिपादिता etc. Ca. C. D. अभिष्टुताः आसन् नः असम्यं अर्कं अर्चनीयं उपमं सर्वोत्कृष्टं अन्नं यच्छंतु ददंतु चंद्राः आह्लादकाः सर्वे यूयं etc. B. This shows that the omission after आह्लादकाः existed also in the B. copies. According to VII. 40, 7, where the same verse is explained again, the original explanation was चंद्रा आह्लादका देवा नोऽस्मभ्यमर्कमर्चनीयमन्नमुपमं सर्वोत्कृष्टं यच्छंतु । ददंतु ॥

P. 80. l. 10. (VII. 40, 1.) युष्मान् ॥ युष्मदीयान् A. C. Ca. D. B 1.

P. 82. l. 20. (VII. 40, 7.) See VII. 39, 7. The repetition of the commentary, though in an abridged form, shows that the lacuna in the former instance existed already in the original codex of the commentary.

P. 84. l. 23. (VII. 41, 5.) वा before वयं by conjecture.

P. 85. l. 7. (VII. 41, 6.) उधोदेवताः B 4. उधोदेवाः A. C. Ca. D. उपसो देवाः B 1.: cf. the next verse.

P. 86. l. 18. (VII. 42, 2.) सु before युञ्ज from B. Sáyana took सुते for सु ते, and immediately afterwards जनिमानि सन्तः for जनिमा निसन्तः.

P. 87. l. 12. (VII. 42, 4.) वीरकस्य only in A. B 1.

P. 89. l. 8. (VII. 43, 2.) साधकं ॥ साधुकं A. B. C. Ca. D.

P. 89. l. 9. (VII. 43, 2.) वेद्यां B 4. वेद्यं B 1. वेद्या A. C. Ca. वेद्या D.: cf. the next verse.

P. 89. l. 16. (VII. 43, 3.) जननीं ॥ जननीयं A. C. Ca. D. B 1.; not in B 4.

P. 89. l. 16. (VII. 43, 3.) अस्माकं ॥ अस्मानं C. Ca. अस्मान् A. B. D.

P. 90. l. 6. (VII. 43, 4.) यति स्यः, and the explanation of it, is left out in A. B. C. Ca. It could easily be supplied in this way : यति स्य यावतः स्य तावतः etc.

P. 92. l. 20. (VII. 45, 1.) The Viniyogas are left out in A. and B. सूच्यते हि ॥ etc. सूच्यते हि । चतुर्थेऽह्न्या देवो यात्वित्येषा वपानुवाक्य । सूत्रितं च etc. D. The lacuna may be supplied in this way : सूच्यते हि चतुर्थेऽह्न्या देवो यातु प्र द्यावेति ॥ छा° t. t. ॥ सावित्रे पञ्चावा देवो यात्वित्येषा वपानु-वाक्या । सूत्रितं च etc.

P. 94. l. 26. (VII. 46, 1.) देवाय ॥ रुद्राय A. C. Ca. D. B 1. रुद्राय देवाय भरत etc. B 4.

P. 95. l. 10. (VII. 46, 2.) क्षम्यः is probably left out after भवः.

P. 95. l. 13. (VII. 46, 2.) अस्मदीयानि गृहाणि from C. Ca. D.

P. 95. l. 20. (VII. 46, 3.) अंतरिक्षसकाशात् B 4. अंतरिक्षात्सकाशात् A. C. Ca. D. B 1.

P. 95. l. 21. (VII. 46, 3.) क्षित्वा ॥ हित्वा A. The whole passage is left out in C. Ca. D.

P. 95. l. 22. (VII. 46, 3.) स्वपिवात जितप्राण B 4.

P. 96. l. 19. (VII. 47, 1.) From सोमाख्यं to तन्मूर्ति taken from C. Ca. D.

MS. E. I. H. 2612 (Colebrooke), containing the 5th Ashtaka, is the same as Ca. See, for instance, VII. 50, 4.

P. 98. l. 19. (VII. 48, 1.) मनुष्यहितं ॥ मनुष्य A. C. Ca. D. B 1. नराहं B 4.

P. 98. l. 25. (VII. 48, 2.) उरु भवंतीत्युभवः ॥ उरु भवंत्युभवः B 1. C. Ca. D. पुरु भवंत्युभवः A. उरु भवन् क्षुभव B 4. The original reading might have been something like उरु भवंती-त्युभवः । व्यत्ययेनैकवचनं । क्षुभवः संतः.

P. 99. l. 14. (VII. 48, 3.) मेधतेः ॥ मित्याते B. मिध्याते A. मिप्राते Ca. D.

P. 100. l. 20. (VII. 49, 2.) समुद्रार्थाः before समुद्र from B.

P. 101. l. 12. (VII. 49, 4.) साकः A. C. and Ca. pr. man. सकः Ca. sec. man. and D. before सोमः.

P. 102. l. 5. (VII. 50, 1.) त्सरुश्छन्नगामी B 1. त्सरुः छ आगामी A. C. Ca. D. त्सरुः सयः B 4. : cf. त्सर छन्नगतौ in the Dhātup.

P. 102. l. 13. (VII. 50, 2.) कुल्फौ गुल्फौ B 4. गुल्फौ गुप्तौ A. C. Ca. D. गुल्फौ गु च B 1.

P. 103. l. 8. (VII. 50, 4.) या निवतो to या उदन्व° from D. या निवतो नीचैर्गच्छन्त्यः । या उदन्तो या ऊर्द्ध्वं गच्छन्त्यः B 4.

P. 104. l. 4. (VII. 51, 1.) चादितित्वेऽदीनत्वे च B 4. चा अदितित्वेऽदीनत्वेन A. C. Ca. D. अदित्वेति अदीनत्वे B 1.

P. 109. l. 11. (VII. 55, 1.) आद्या गायत्री etc. ॥ आद्या गायत्री द्वितीयाद्याश्चतस्रोऽनुष्टुभः पंचम्याद्यास्ति स उप° । A. C. Ca. D. and B 4. pr. man. आद्या गायत्री द्वितीयाद्यास्ति स उपरिष्टाद्बृहत् पंचम्याद्या-स्ति स्रोऽनुष्टुभः B 4. sec. man., and B 1.

P. 109. l. 18. (VII. 55, 1.) प्रस्थापयामास ॥ प्रस्थापयामास? See also VII. 45, 1.

P. 109. l. 18. (VII. 55, 1.) वारुणं Ca. D. वरुणं B 1.; ibid. कोशागारे B 1.

P. 110. l. 2. (VII. 55, 1.) तत्तद्देवा विशन्ति C. D. तत्तद्देवा विशति A. Ca. तत्तद्देवो विशति C. Colebr. तद्वचना भवति B 1. तत्तद्देवता भवति Roth's edition.

P. 112. l. 6. (VII. 55, 7.) सूर्यः from C. Ca. D.

P. 112. l. 12. (VII. 55, 8.) प्राङ्गणे A. प्राक्गणे Ca. D. प्राक् प्रवणे C. प्राङ्गणे B. 1. 4.

P. 112. l. 16. (VII. 55, 8.) The Sanhitās have at the end of the third Anuvāka a Khila.

स्वप्नः स्वप्नाधिकरणे सर्वं नि ध्यायया जनं<sup>a</sup> ।

आ सूर्यमन्यान्स्वापयद्वा<sup>b</sup> जाग्रियाद्दहं<sup>b</sup> ॥ १ ॥

अजगरो नाम सर्पः सर्पिरविषो महान् ।

तस्मिन्ह सर्पः सुधितस्तेन त्वा<sup>c</sup> स्वापयामसि ॥ २ ॥

सर्पः सर्पो अजगरः सर्पिरविषो महान् ।

यस्य शुष्कात्सिधवस्तस्य<sup>d</sup> गाधमंशीमहि ॥ ३ ॥

काठिको नाम सर्पो नवनागसहस्रबलः ।

यमुनह्ने हं सो जातोऽयो नारायणवाहनः ॥ ४ ॥

यदि काठिकदूतस्य यदि का<sup>e</sup> काठिकाद्रयात्<sup>f</sup> ।

जन्मभूमिमतिक्रान्तो<sup>g</sup> निर्विषो याति काठिकः ॥ ५ ॥

आ याहीन्द्र पृथिवीरिठितेभिर्यज्ञमिमं नो भागधेयं जुषस्व ।

तृमां जुहुमोतुं तस्येव<sup>h</sup> योषां भागस्ते पैतृध्वसेयी वषामिव ॥ ६ ॥

यशस्करं बलवंतं प्रभुत्वं तमेव राजाधिपतिर्बभूव ।

संकीर्णनागाश्चपतितैराणां सुमंगल्यं सततं दीर्घमायुः ॥ ७ ॥

कर्कोटको नाम सर्पो यो दृष्टीविष उच्यते ।

तस्य सर्पस्य सर्पत्वं तस्मै सर्पे नमोऽस्तु ते ॥ ८ ॥

S. 2. adds the following verses :

यो दो राचने दिवो ये वा सूर्यस्य रश्मिषु ।

तेषामप्सु सदस्कृतं तेभ्यः सर्पेभ्यो नमः ॥ ९ ॥<sup>i</sup>

नमो अस्तु सर्पेभ्यो ये के च पृथिवीमनु ।

ये अंतरिक्षे ये दिवि तेभ्यः सर्पेभ्यो नमः ॥ १० ॥

उग्रायुधा प्रमतिन प्रवीरा मायाविनो बलिनो मिच्छमानाः ।

ये देवा असुरान्पराभवन्तांस्त्वं वज्रेण मघवन्निवारय ॥ ११ ॥<sup>k</sup>

परिशिष्टवर्गः S. 2. at the end.

P. 114. l. 21. (VII. 56, 8.) कंपयितुवेगः A. Ca. कंपयितुं वेगः (sic). कंपयितुः or कंपयिता?

P. 115. l. 1. (VII. 56, 9.) The commentary to this and to the next verse is omitted in A. C. Ca. D. and C. Colebr. All the C. MSS. (exc. B. 1.) have सनेम्यस्मदिति ---

<sup>a</sup> जरं P. S. MS. Wilson, 437. जिनं MS. Wilson, 431.

<sup>b</sup> जाग्रयाद्दहं S. 1.

<sup>c</sup> नस्त्वा P. S.

<sup>d</sup> सर्पात्सि P. S.

<sup>e</sup> काः P. S. MS. Wilson.

<sup>f</sup> द्रव्यं Colebr. S. 1. MS. Wilson.

<sup>g</sup> भूमि

परि<sup>o</sup> Colebr.

<sup>h</sup> जहु P. S. MS. Wilson.

<sup>i</sup> Deest in P. S.

<sup>k</sup> Deest in P. S.

चुगन्वयस्यक्तः 1. The explanation printed in brackets is written by a later hand on the margin of C. Colebr. B 4. has the following spurious commentary:

Verse 9. सनेमि पुराणं परंपरागतं दिष्टुं दीप्यमानं वर्षमानमित्यर्थः वः युष्मात्सस्य अस्मात् अस्मत्तः मा युयोत मा पृथक् कुरुत । किंच इह युष्मात्सस्ये नः अस्मान् दुर्नैतिः मा प्रणक् न प्राप्नोतु ॥

Verse 10. ह मरुतः तुराणां यजमानार्थं त्वरया आगच्छतां वः युष्माकं नाम आहुवे आह्वयामि यत् येन आह्वानेन प्रियाः चेहयुक्ताः वावशानाः अस्माकं आह्वानं कृतमिति शब्दायमानाश्च संतः तृपन् संतुष्टाः भविष्यन्त तत् आह्वानमिति शेषः ॥

P. 116. l. 9. (VII. 56, 13.) Sáyana reads वक्षः सुरुक्ताः instead of वक्षःसु रुक्ताः.

P. 118. l. 19. (VII. 56, 18.) त्वदीयं A. B. C. Ca. D.

P. 122. l. 20. (VII. 57, 3.) रोचमानैराभरयैराभरयैः ॥ रोचमानैराभरयैराभरयैः A. B. C. Ca. D.

P. 123. l. 8. (VII. 57, 4.) हि प्रमदः ॥ क्षिप्रमदः A. C. Ca. D. क्षिप्रयागः B 1.

P. 128. l. 20. (VII. 59, 4.) न सहते A. B. C. Ca. D.

P. 129. l. 24. (VII. 59, 7.) निषीदतु ॥ निषेदतु A. B 4. C. Ca. D. तु B 1.

P. 130. l. 10. (VII. 59, 8.) स जनो A. B. C. Ca. D.

P. 131. l. 16. (VII. 59, 12.) No commentary is given in A. Ca., Ca. Colebr., which mark the omission. C. explains the verse: वयं अंबकं त्रिलोचनं यजामहे । किंलक्षणं । सुगंधिं

शोभनगंधोपेतं पुष्टिवर्धनं पुष्टेः पोषकं । हे रुद्र मा मां मृतात् मरणात् मुक्षीय । मां मोचय । कस्मात्कमिव बंधनात् नात् वत् उर्वारुकमिन्द्रवारुकमिव बंधनं प्रत्यक्षसुतिः ॥ B. has the following: अंबकं त्रिलोकस्य मातृभूतं । पालकमित्यर्थः । सुगंधिं सुष्ठु व्यापकं पुष्टिवर्धनं यजमानस्य बलं वर्धयितारं एतादृशं रुद्रं यजामहे । वयं यजमानच्युतिजो हविर्भिः पूजयामहे । किमर्थं । मृत्योः सकाशात् मुक्षीय । मुंचेय । मामृतात् । अमृतात् मोक्षात् नैव मुक्षीय इत्येतदर्थं । दृष्टांतः । बंधनात् वृतात् उर्वारुकमिव उर्वारुकमलमिव । तद्यथा ईषत्प्रयत्नेन मुंचत इति तद्वत् ॥ The explanation given in brackets is taken literally from D. MS. E. I. H. 2612. अंबकं त्रिनेत्रं महादेवं यजामहे पूजयामः । कीदृशं । सुगंधिं दिव्यगंधोपेतं । marg. पुष्टिवर्धनं पुत्रपश्चादिपुष्टिहेतुं । अहं तत्प्रसादात्मृत्योर्मुक्षीय मुक्तः स्यां । मोचने दृष्टांतः । उर्वारुकमिव । बंधनात् यथा जीर्भटं पक्कं स्वयमेव वृतात्मुक्तं भवति तद्वत् अमृतात् मुक्तावस्थातो वा मा मुक्तः स्यां ॥

P. 133. l. 1. (VII. 60, 1.) वयं repeated after अदीनदेव in A. B. C. Ca.

P. 133. l. 13. (VII. 60, 2.) नृचक्षा नृणां मनुष्याणां दृष्टा from B.

P. 133. l. 15. (VII. 60, 2.) स्थितानि B 1. स्थितानि A. Ca.

P. 134. l. 2. (VII. 60, 3.) तदवांतरगोव्यक्तं च ॥ तदवांतरगोव्यक्तं A. B. तदवांतरगोव्यक्तं च C. Ca.

P. 135. l. 5. (VII. 60, 6.) सामर्थ्येऽश्रितयंति from B.

P. 135. l. 5. (VII. 60, 6.) क्रतुं कर्तारं ॥ कृतं कर्तारं C. अपि क्रतुं सुचेतसं etc. A. C. Ca.

P. 135. l. 17. (VII. 60, 7.) विस्मितस्य ॥ विप्रामस्य Nir.

P. 137. l. 6. (VII. 60, 11.) तासां after स्तोता A. C. Ca. B 1.

P. 137. l. 10. (VII. 60, 12.) All the Sanhitá MSS. have देव here and in the repetition of the same verse at the end of the next hymn.

P. 137. l. 16. (VII. 60, 12.) दुःखेन ॥ दुःखानि A. B. C.

P. 137. l. 17. (VII. 60, 12.) शिष्टो गतः A. C. Ca. B 1.

P. 138. l. 14. (VII. 61, 2.) यत्कर्त्तव्यं A. B. Ca. यत्कर्त्तव्यं? B 4. has कर्त्तव्यं समर्थेन कर्मणा after शोभनकर्माणां.

P. 138. l. 25. (VII. 61, 3.) चृधक् यत् चृधक् सत्येन यतो विवेकात् ॥ चृधक् यत् चृधक् सत्यान् यतः विवेकान् Ca. चृधक् यत् चृधक् सत्यान् यतः विवेकात् A. चृधक् यत् चृधक् सत्यान् यतः विवेकान् C. चृधक् यतः सत्येन यतः विवेकात्. The emendation given is simpler than it would be to read सत्यान् यतो ('different from truth'). चृधक् यतः चृधक् सत्येन यतः विवेकात् B 1.

P. 139. l. 17. (VII. 61, 4.) वां from B. युवाभ्यां ॥ युवां A. B. C. Ca.

P. 139. l. 21. (VII. 61, 5.) नाभूवन् । न भवंति ॥ भूवन् भवंति A. C. Ca. अभूवन् भवंति B.

P. 141. l. 1. (VII. 62, 1.) B 4. gives a marginal explanation of प्रतिनियतः । नियमेन देवसादृश्यत्वेनोपादानात् ।

P. 141. l. 11. (VII. 62, 2.) कृष्णशवास्यु° A. कृष्णशतास्यु° Ca. कृष्णशतास्यु° C. कृष्णवाग्न्युज-  
रत्तो B 1. Ait. Bráh. V. 14.

P. 147. l. 12. (VII. 64, 4.) तं is probably dropped before जनं.

P. 149. l. 14. (VII. 65, 4.) वां युवां प्रति repeated after लोके in A. C. Ca. B 1.; not in B 4.

P. 150. l. 3. (VII. 66, 1.) आद्यंतौ ॥ आद्यंतौ A. B. C. Ca.

P. 150. l. 24. (VII. 66, 3.) गृहाः ॥ ग्रहाः A. B. C. Ca.: cf. Rv. VII. 19, 11. Rv. X. 69, 4, it is explained by यज्ञानां पालयिता.

P. 151. l. 20. (VII. 66, 6.) रक्षका ॥ रक्षक A. C. Ca.; deest in B 1, 4.

P. 154. l. 9. (VII. 66, 13.) प्रजापतेः B 4. प्रजातेः A. C. Ca. B 1.

P. 155. l. 7. (VII. 66, 15.) सूर्यं वहति ॥ अयं वहति A. B 1. अयं वहति C. Ca. अश्वो वहति B 4.

P. 155. l. 9. (VII. 66, 15.) सुविताय कल्याणाय from B 4. प्रकाशाय B 1.

P. 155. l. 19. (VII. 66, 16.) हविःस्त्रीका° ॥ हविःस्त्रीकापस्वैतदीयाधीनत्वात् Ca. हविस्त्रीकारस्वैतदीयाधीन-  
त्वात् A.; quite corrupt in C.; not in B 4. हविःस्त्रीकारस्वैतदीयाधीनत्वात् B 1. pr. man. cor-  
rected to °स्य तदीयाधीनत्वात्.

P. 156. l. 7. (VII. 66, 18.) द्युलोक° C. Ca. द्यु° A. B.

P. 157. l. 4. (VII. 67, 1.) All MSS., except B 1, 4., mark a lacuna after शेषः । to केनेति तदु°. A later hand in Ca. Colebr. supplies it केन साधनेनेति.

P. 158. l. 8. (VII. 67, 4.) युवाभ्यां MSS. युवयोः?

P. 158. l. 10. (VII. 67, 4.) अतो वां स्वभूतः ॥ अतोवा A. अतोवाव C. Ca. अति वा B 1.; not in B 4. भवामीति शेषः is expected after it.

P. 159. l. 8. (VII. 67, 6.) लब्धे B. लब्धे C. Ca.; illegible in A.; perhaps लब्धे.

P. 160. l. 5. (VII. 67, 8.) गंगाद्याकाः A. C. Ca. गंगाद्याः B 1, 4.: cf. Pán. VII. 4, 15.

P. 160. l. 5. (VII. 67, 8.) तद्रथान्नाः B 1. रथान् कुलाः B 4. रथान् कुला A. Ca.; left out in C. तद्रथानुकूला?

P. 163. l. 5. (VII. 68, 5.) चृवीसं A. चृ-स Ca. चृष्वा वासं B 1. चृषि (सा वा) सं B 4.

P. 163. l. 7. (VII. 68, 5.) धारयति B 1. धारयत् A. C. Ca. धारयेत् B 4.

P. 163. l. 15. (VII. 68, 6.) तस्य रूपस्य प्रत्याप्नौ ॥ नतस्य रूपस्य प्रत्याप्य A. Ca. तस्य रूपस्य प्रत्याप्य C. नतस्य रूपस्य प्रत्याप्य B 4. pr. man. तस्य रूपस्य प्रत्ययं B 4. sec. man. तस्य रूपस्य प्रत्यायं भूतं अभूत् B 1. Perhaps नवस्य रूपस्य प्रत्याप्यं. Cf. IV. 5, 14.

P. 164. l. 10. (VII. 68, 8.) धनादात्ते ॥ धनदात्ते A. B 1, 4. C. Ca.



P. 164. l. 15. (VII. 68, 8.) नदीं तां ॥ नदीनां A. B 1. 4. नदीतां C. Ca.

P. 167. l. 13. (VII. 69, 6.) C. Mill has a lacuna from this verse to the beginning of the sixth Adhyāya.

P. 167. l. 15. (VII. 69, 6.) नियच्छंतु ॥ नियंतु A. Ca. नियतु B 4. नानयंतु B 1.

P. 167. l. 21. (VII. 69, 7.) विस्त्रिं A. B 1. 4. Ca. निस्त्रिं?

P. 168. l. 19. (VII. 70, 1.) अश्वोऽस्यात् B 1. अलो न अश्वोऽस्यात् Ca. अलो न अश्वोऽस्यात् A. अश्वो न अश्वः अस्यात् B 4.

P. 168. l. 22. (VII. 70, 1.) योनिं स्थानमिव A. Ca. B 4. योनिं स्थानमिव B 1.

P. 169. l. 4. (VII. 70, 2.) वा before वां by conjecture.

P. 169. l. 25. (VII. 70, 4.) चनिष्टं etc. Sāyana explains चनिष्टं either as a verbal form or as a superlative.

P. 170. l. 13. (VII. 70, 5.) जनाय from B 4., which has not जनस्य.

P. 170. l. 14. (VII. 70, 5.) भवतु B 4. भवति A. Ca.

P. 172. l. 22. (VII. 71, 4.) यो by conjecture.

P. 172. l. 25. (VII. 71, 4.) यद्रथो ॥ तद्रथो A. Ca. B 1. यद्यथ रथो etc. B 4.

P. 173. l. 1. (VII. 71, 4.) अथवाह B 1. अथ आह A. B 4. Ca. It may be अन्य आह; cf. Rv. VI. 42, 2.

P. 173. l. 2. (VII. 71, 4.) वां ॥ वा A. B. Ca.

P. 173. l. 12. (VII. 71, 5.) निपात्यतं ॥ निपात्यतं A. निपात्यतं B. Ca.

P. 174. l. 7. (VII. 72, 1.) गोप्रदेन ॥ गोप्रदेशेन A. B. Ca. गोप्रदेशेन?

P. 174. l. 16. (VII. 72, 2.) बंधुत्वातिशय B 1. बंध्वीतिशय A. Ca.; not in B 4.

P. 174. l. 21. (VII. 72, 2.) The passage from the Brihaddevatā is quoted by Kuhn in the Zeitschrift für vergl. Sprachforschung I. 442. from a Berlin MS. of the same. Various readings from A. Colebrooke are published by Prof. Roth amongst the errata of the same volume. The readings marked M. M. are from a MS. lately (1862) received from India. It generally agrees with the Berlin MS., and the readings of these two MSS. are mostly preferable to those of the MSS. of Sāyana. According to the principles, however, which I have tried to follow throughout this edition of Sāyana, I was not at liberty to receive them in the text, because the MSS. clearly show that Sāyana was either not acquainted or not satisfied with these readings, and that he gave his extracts from the Brihaddevatā either from other MSS. or from memory.

P. 174. l. 22. (VII. 72, 2.) सरखूं Kuhn, M. M. सरखूं A. Ca. B.

P. 174. l. 23. (VII. 72, 2.) सरख्यां B 1. सरख्यां A. Ca. Roth found सरख्या. सरखोर्जे M. M.

P. 174. l. 23. (VII. 72, 2.) जाते ते A. B 1. जातते Ca. जज्ञाते Kuhn, M. M.

P. 174. l. 24. (VII. 72, 2.) वै यमः Ca. तै यमः A. रस्या व तै B 1. The Brihad. has तै चापुभौ यमावेव ज्यायांस्ताभ्यां तु वै यमः ॥ M. M.

P. 174. l. 24. (VII. 72, 2.) सरखूं Kuhn, M. M. सरखूं A. B. सरखूं Ca.

P. 174. l. 25. (VII. 72, 2.) उपचक्रमे Kuhn. त्वोपचक्रमे M. M.

- P. 174. l. 25. (VII. 72, 2.) अविज्ञानात् Kuhn, A., M. M. अविज्ञातात् Ca.  
 P. 174. l. 26. (VII. 72, 2.) राजर्षि° ॥ राजर्षिर्भवत्सोऽपि M. M.  
 P. 174. l. 26. (VII. 72, 2.) अपक्रांतां ॥ त्वपक्रांतां Kuhn, M. M. आत्मरूपिणीं ॥ अश्वरूपिणीं Kuhn, M. M.  
 P. 175. l. 1. (VII. 72, 2.) सरस्यूलं Kuhn. सरस्यूल M. M. जिज्ञाय A. B. विज्ञाय Ca. वि-  
 दित्वा M. M.  
 P. 175. l. 2. (VII. 72, 2.) हर्यरूपिणं ॥ भर्यरूपिणं A. B. भर्यरूपिणं Ca. हर्यरूपिणं Kuhn. हर्यर-  
 पिणं M. M.  
 P. 175. l. 3. (VII. 72, 2.) तच्छुक्रं Kuhn, M. M. तं शुक्रं A. Ca. B.  
 P. 175. l. 3. (VII. 72, 2.) गर्भकाम्यया Kuhn, M. M. गतकाम्यया A. Ca. B.  
 P. 175. l. 3. (VII. 72, 2.) आघातमात्राच्छुक्रान्तु Kuhn, M. M. (only शुक्र° throughout).  
 P. 175. l. 4. (VII. 72, 2.) अश्विनाविति Kuhn, M. M.  
 P. 175. l. 7. (VII. 72, 3.) धिष्येमे all Sanhitá MSS.  
 P. 175. l. 8. (VII. 72, 3.) Sáyana read अश्विना for अश्विनोः. The Pada MS. (Mill)  
 had indeed अश्विना pr. man. अश्विनोः B.  
 P. 175. l. 12. (VII. 72, 3.) परिवृढानि ॥ कर्मपरिवृढानि A. Ca. B 1.; left out in B 4.  
 P. 176. l. 8. (VII. 72, 5.) दक्षिणत from B. दक्षिण A. Ca.  
 P. 177. l. 3. (VII. 73, 2.) मनुषः सकाशात् ॥ मनुषसकाशात् A. Ca.; deest in B.  
 P. 178. l. 4. (VII. 73, 4.) समगच्छंतं ॥ समगच्छतं A. गच्छतं च Ca. गच्छतं B 4.; deest  
 in B 1.  
 P. 180. l. 12. (VII. 74, 5.) प्रगच्छतं । A. B. C. प्रगच्छतां ?  
 P. 181. l. 4. (VII. 75, 1.) हिरण्यानि A. Ca. B 1. हिरण्यादि Rig-vidh.  
 P. 181. l. 4. (VII. 75, 1.) गा अश्वान् Rig-vidh. गावोऽश्वान् A. Ca. B 1.  
 P. 181. l. 4. (VII. 75, 1.) धन्यान् A. Ca. धान्यान् B 1. धान्या Rig-vidh.  
 P. 181. l. 5. (VII. 75, 1.) अजाविकं A. Ca. B 1. अजाविकान् Rig-vidh.  
 P. 181. l. 14. (VII. 75, 1.) It would be better to read इति तिलोपः.  
 P. 182. l. 12. (VII. 75, 3.) सरंति A. B. प्रसरंति Ca.  
 P. 182. l. 19. (VII. 75, 4.) चतुरो वर्णां ॥ चतुरो वर्णाः A. Ca. B 1. चत्वारो वर्णाः तान् B 4.  
 P. 183. l. 4. (VII. 75, 5.) अद्वैको योग° ॥ अद्वैयो योग° A. अद्वैको याग° Ca. अत्र योग° B 1.  
 P. 183. l. 5. (VII. 75, 5.) रश्माख्य° ॥ रश्माख्य° A. Ca. B 1. रश्माख्य without विचित° B 4.  
 P. 185. l. 22. (VII. 76, 3.) Sáyana took जार for the locative.  
 P. 185. l. 23. (VII. 76, 3.) अत्यजैव ॥ अत्यजैव A. अत्यजैव B 1.; the whole passage is  
 left out in B 4. Ca.  
 P. 185. l. 24. (VII. 76, 3.) यती परित्यजे° ॥ यती पतिपरित्यजेत ततः संचरंतीत्यभिचारिणीव A. यती पतिं  
 परित्यजेत ततः संचरंतीत्यभिचारिणीव Ca. यथा अभिचारिणी पतिं न त्यजति तद्वत् सूर्यं अपरित्यजंती त्वं B 4. यती  
 पतिं परित्यजेत नः संचरंति अभिचारिणीव सूर्यमपरित्यजती त्वं B 1.  
 P. 188. l. 2. (VII. 77, 1.) वा after वापमानं A. Ca. B 1.  
 P. 189. l. 9. (VII. 77, 4.) वसूनि to आहर from B 4.  
 P. 189. l. 20. (VII. 77, 5.) रथद्वयैरुपेतं from B 4.

P. 190. l. 14. (VII. 78, 1.) अस्यं repeated after धनं in A. Ca. B 1.

P. 193. l. 10. (VII. 79, 3.) राज्यवसानस्य ॥ रात्रिवसानस्य A. Ca. रात्रिवसानस्य B 1.

P. 194. l. 5. (VII. 79, 5.) धनलाभाय A. B 1.

C. Mill begins again from the sixth Adhyāya, but as it does not differ from Ca., it is only occasionally mentioned.

P. 198. l. 15. (VII. 81, 6.) A. omits all from म्रिय° to the end.

P. 199. l. 17. (VII. 82, 2.) वां युवां A. B. Ca. It should be युवाभ्यां, as immediately afterwards.

P. 199. l. 18. (VII. 82, 2.) शरीरदाढीय etc. A. Ca. B 1. ओजः शरीरदाढीहेतुभूतं संदधुः B.

P. 199. l. 19. (VII. 82, 2.) ओजो नाष्टमी दशेति A. ओजो नाष्टमी ॥ दशेति Ca. ओजः साष्टमी दशेति B 1.

P. 200. l. 25. (VII. 82, 5.) जातिमंति ॥ जतिमंति A. जनिमंति B 1. संति Ca.

P. 203. l. 22. (VII. 83, 1.) आच्छयति ॥ आच्छयैति Ca. अछयैति A. अछैति B 1.

P. 204. l. 9. (VII. 83, 2.) वीताश्च A. Ca. वीराश्च B.

P. 207. l. 16. (VII. 83, 10.) धनं from B 1. 4.

P. 210. l. 8. (VII. 85, 1.) षोडश ॥ उद्दिश्य B 1. and margin of B 4. षोडस्य A. Ca.

P. 210. l. 9. (VII. 85, 1.) शिष्टः etc. In all cases, where the masculine is used, पादः has to be supplied.

P. 211. l. 8. (VII. 85, 3.) असांकर्येण A. (cf. Wilson, s. v. सांकर्य). असांकार्येण Ca. आसां-कार्येण B. असाकर्येण B 1.

P. 214. l. 7. (VII. 86, 5.) च after विश्लेषय A. Ca. B.; not in C.

P. 214. l. 9. (VII. 86, 5.) वासादिभिः Ca. B 1. वासादिभिः A. यवसादिभिः B 4.

P. 214. l. 16. (VII. 86, 6.) स्वभूतं तद्वलं A. B 1. स्वरूपवद्वलं Ca.; not in B 4.

P. 214. l. 18. (VII. 86, 6.) प्रमाद° B. प्रमोद A. Ca.

P. 214. l. 23. (VII. 86, 6.) तं यमधो निमीषत A. तं यमनिमीषत Ca. तं यमधो निमीषता B 4.

P. 220. l. 21. (VII. 88, 3.) वभूविष ॥ वभूव A. Ca. भवाव B 4. वभूतां B 1.

P. 221. l. 4. (VII. 88, 4.) Sāyana read स्वपामवोभिः instead of स्वपा महोभिः.

P. 222. l. 2. (VII. 88, 6.) सखा Ca. ससखा A. after सखा.

P. 223. l. 11. (VII. 89, 3.) प्रतिकूलमननुष्ठानं Ca. प्रतिकूलितमनुष्ठानं A. अननुष्ठानं B 4. प्रतिकूल-लनुष्ठानं B 1.

P. 225. l. 10. (VII. 90, 2.) Sāyana seems to take वाक्सी अस्य as one word.

P. 226. l. 21. (VII. 90, 5.) स्वकीयत्वे विहितेन A. स्वकीयस्य विहितेन Ca. स्वकीयेन विहितेन B 4. स्वकीयेनैव B 1.

P. 231. l. 20. (VII. 92, 1.) उप समीपे from B 4.

P. 233. l. 11. (VII. 92, 4.) सूर्यः स्रोतारः A. B. Ca.

P. 235. l. 2. (VII. 93, 2.) संयोजयतं ॥ स्वयोजयतं A. Ca. योजयतं B.

P. 235. l. 13. (VII. 93, 3.) भूमिं व्याप्नुवंति B 4. भूम्यां व्याप्नुवंति A. भूम्यां चाप्नुवंति Ca. B 1.

P. 236. l. 7. (VII. 93, 5.) A. C. omit all from तनूरुचा to हतं 1. B 4. has स्वर्धौ कुर्वन्तौ शूरसाता शूरसातौ रणे यतैते यत्नं कुर्वन्तौ वैरिसेने तनूरुचा आत्मीयेन तेजसा सं यत् ये सदा हतं सततं हिंसं तथा

सोमसुता सोममभिषुषता जनेन यतमानसंघेन देवयुभिः देवान् कामयमानैः सह विदये यज्ञे त्वदेवयुं असोमसुतं ज्ञानं सं हिंसं ॥ B 1. has तनूरुचा ॥ चौदिक हतं. All left out in Ca.

P. 237. l. 13. (VII. 93, 8.) ना before परिख्यन् by conjecture.

P. 238. l. 13. (VII. 94, 3.) पापलाय पापवह्नाय Ca.

P. 243. l. 15. (VII. 95, 5.) पवित्रेष्वां B 1. परिवेष्वां A. C. Ca.

P. 243. l. 23. (VII. 95, 5.) त्वद्विष° B 4. नृपद्विष° A. Ca. B 1.

P. 244. l. 6. (VII. 95, 6.) यंतुः ॥ यंतु A. Ca.; not in B 1. 4.

P. 244. l. 10. (VII. 96, 1.) द्वितीया सतोवृहती left out in A. Ca. B 1. द्वितीया प्रस्तारपंक्तिः तृतीया सतोवृहती B 4.

P. 244. l. 11. (VII. 96, 1.) सरस्वदेवताकः ॥ सरस्वानदेवताकः A. Ca. B.

P. 252. l. 5. (VII. 98, 3.) सदिते° ॥ सदित इन्द्रमादित्यस्योक्तत्वात् A. Ca. B 4.

P. 252. l. 18. (VII. 98, 4.) अभियुध्येच्छ ॥ अभियुध्यस्व A. B. Ca.

P. 253. l. 10. (VII. 98, 6.) Sáyana seems to have read तवेदिदं.

P. 254. l. 12. (VII. 99, 1.) ज्ञान्यत् B 1. 4. मान्यत् A. Ca.

P. 255. l. 16. (VII. 99, 1.) After पृथिवीमूर्द्ध्वमुखत्वेन, Ca. marg. adds ग्रामभोमुखत्वेन.

P. 255. l. 17. (VII. 99, 3.) पर्वतैः from B 4. Ca. marg. कीलसदृशैः पर्वतैः marg. of C. Colebrooke; deest in Ca. B 1. A.

P. 256. l. 13. (VII. 99, 5.) सह सद्य एव ॥ संपद्य स एव A. सद्यस एव (perhaps for संपद्य एव) Ca. सह सद्य एव B 1.

P. 256. l. 24. (VII. 99, 6.) वृजनेषु आ युस्तु B 4.

P. 260. l. 26. (VII. 100, 6.) गूढरूपोऽपि ॥ गूढरूपाणि A. गूढरूपाणि Ca. गूढरूपोऽपि B 1.

P. 261. l. 23. (VII. 101, 1.) तिस्रसादिभ्यामुपतिष्ठेत् भास्करं A. तिस्रमुपतिष्ठेत् भास्करं एताभ्यां Ca. तिस्र दीदित्यमुपतिष्ठेत् भास्करं B 1. तिस्र एताभ्यामुपतिष्ठेद्विवाकरं Rig-vidh.

P. 262. l. 1. (VII. 101, 1.) पंचरात्रे च्यतीते तु महद्भयमत्रांमुयात् Rig-vidh.

P. 269. l. 3. (VII. 103, 7.) सर्वतो ॥ तो A. Ca.; deest in B 1.

P. 270. l. 11. (VII. 103, 10.) The following verse is given by the Sanhitá MSS. at the end of this hymn.

उपप्रवद° संज्ञिकी° ब्रह्मैवा वंद तदुदरि ।

मध्ये हृत्स्यं प्रवस्व निगृह्यं चतुरः पदः ॥

Cf. Átharva-veda IV. 15, 14. उपप्रवद.

P. 270. l. 22. (VII. 104, 1.) वा after पंचैद्धो A. Ca.; not in B 1. and Anukr.

P. 273. l. 4. (VII. 104, 5.) अश्मसारभूतस्य B 1. अश्मसारभूतस्य A. Ca. अश्मसारभूत (?)

P. 273. l. 19. (VII. 104, 6.) यथा before धनैः by conjecture. नृपतीक is not explained in A. Ca. B. The omission took place probably after स्तोत्राणि, and Sáyana's explanation might have been स्तोत्राणि नृपतीव राजा नास्तिव तौ यथा धनैः पूरयतः तथा etc. B 4. has at the end दृष्टांतः नृपतीव राजानौ इव तौ यथा पूरयतः तद्वत् ॥

P. 274. l. 2. (VII. 104, 7.) द्रोणधून् B 1. 4. Ca. and A. pr. man. डेहून् A. sec. man.

P. 274. l. 20. (VII. 104, 9.) पविषदंति B I. 4. Ca. पविषवन्ति A.

P. 275. l. 25. (VII. 104, 12.) इदमादिभिः ॥ इदमाभिः A. Ca.

P. 276. l. 1. (VII. 104, 12.) वासिष्ठं ॥ वसिष्ठं A. Ca. B I.

P. 276. l. 3. (VII. 104, 12.) वसिष्ठेनेति नः श्रुतं ॥ वसिष्ठो नेति न श्रुतं Ca. वसिष्ठो नेति न श्रुतं A. B I.

P. 276. l. 16. (VII. 104, 13.) इति न मुंचति B I. 4. Ca. इति --- ते A.

P. 280. l. 11. (VII. 104, 22.) शुश्रूलूकः by conjecture.

P. 280. l. 23. (VII. 104, 23.) स्त्रीपुंसं ॥ स्त्रीपुंसं A. B I. 4. स्त्रीपुंसं Ca.

### Mandala VIII.

P. 282. l. 10. (VIII. 1, 1.) ज्योग° B I. प्रयोग° A. ज्ञायोगि° Ca.

P. 282. l. 19. (VIII. 1, 1.) एकोनविंशत् ॥ एकोनविंशो Ca. B I. एकोनविंशो A.

P. 287. l. 24. (VIII. 1, 12.) अभिषेचयान् B I. B 4. sec. man. अभिषेचयानाः B 4. pr. man. अभिषेचयाना A. Ca.

P. 287. l. 24. (VIII. 1, 12.) °द्रव्यान् B I. °द्रव्यान् A. B 4. Ca.

P. 289. l. 21. (VIII. 1, 17.) अदाभ्यहे हिमांदासुत A. अदाभ्याग्रे हिमांदासुत Ca. अदाभ्यग्रे हिमांदासुत B I. The MSS. of Kātyāyana could not be compared for this passage. As it stands it is certainly not correct. It ought to be अदाभ्यग्रे, cf. VIII. 2, 1.

P. 291. l. 1. (VIII. 1, 20.) आश्रावणेन B 4. आश्रावणेन A. Ca. आश्रवणेन B I.

P. 292. l. 22. (VIII. 1, 24.) विभूतयोऽन्ये ॥ विभूतयोने A. Ca. विभूतयो तनो B I.: cf. the following verse.

P. 293. l. 23. (VIII. 1, 26.) स इवैन्द्र ॥ स सैन्द्र° A. Ca.; deest in B.

P. 294. l. 12. (VIII. 1, 27.) न before वियुक्ते by conjecture. विनियुक्ते Ca.

P. 295. l. 12. (VIII. 1, 29.) प्राप्ते ॥ प्रपिते A. Ca.; deest in B.

P. 295. l. 20. (VIII. 1, 30.) मेधातिथये ॥ मेधातिथये A. B. Ca.

P. 296. l. 10. (VIII. 1, 31.) आरोहयं B 4. आरोहयन् A. Ca.; deest in B I.

P. 298. l. 1. (VIII. 2, 1.) च after आंगिरसस्य by conjecture.

P. 298. l. 23. (VIII. 2, 2.) भवतीति ॥ भवतीषु A. Ca. भवतिषु B I. Some omission has taken place, which can be supplied from Sāyana's commentary on the same verse in the Sāma-veda (II. 1, 2, 8, 2): परिपूतः शोधितः दशापवित्रस्य नाभिं पूतया - - शींस्तु कया हि सोमः परिपूयते । तदुक्तं भगवता आपस्तम्बेन शुक्लाम् शींस्तुकां यजनानाय प्रयच्छति तां शकटे दशापवित्रस्य नाभिं कुरुते शुक्लं चल्स्याः पवित्रममोतं भवतीति नदीयु etc.

P. 300. l. 2. (VIII. 2, 5.) नञा च ॥ नञा च A. Ca. नञा च B I.

P. 301. l. 20. (VIII. 2, 6.) इन्द्रं ॥ यमिन्द्रं A. B. Ca.

P. 302. l. 16. (VIII. 2, 12.) छंदांसि तानि । The MSS. offer no various readings, but there is probably a mistake. It may be ग्राहंदांसि or नग्नं छंदांसि, cf. Nigh. I. 11. Or छंदांसि may have been explained as वस्त्राणि छदनात्. Only in all these cases a negation would be wanted, and Sāyana may after all have explained *na-gnāh* by *na gahati*, scil. *chandānsi*.

P. 302. l. 26. (VIII. 2, 13.) तव B. चत एव A. Ca. B.

P. 305. l. 9. (VIII. 2, 20.) दुःसहनं B I. दुःसहहनं Ca. दुःसहहननं A.

P. 306. l. 18. (VIII. 2, 25.) अहीनांतर्गते A. B I. अहानां संतर्गते Ca.

P. 307. l. 13. (VIII. 2, 27.) The commentary to this verse is left out in A. C. Ca. B I. says अस्मार्थः तृतिः. B 4. has the following: ब्रह्मयुजा अन्नवंतौ शग्मा सुखप्रदौ हरी यनादृशौ अश्वौ युवां इह अस्मद्यज्ञे इंद्रं आ वधतः आवहतं कीदृशं इंद्रं अस्मत्सखायं गीर्भिः अस्मत्कृतैः स्तोत्रैः श्रुतं प्रख्यातं गिर्विशसं गिरां संभक्तारं ॥

The commentary given in brackets is taken from Sáyana's commentary to the same verse in the Sāma-veda. स्तुतिभिः श्रुतं प्रापितमाहात्म्यं is an emendation in the MS., the original reading being स्तुतिभिः प्ररेणपितमाहात्म्यं.

P. 310. l. 15. (VIII. 2, 37.) अनुकूलो ॥ अनुकूला B I. अनुकूलवेद्यो Ca. A.

P. 310. l. 16. (VIII. 2, 37.) प्रियमेधा A. B. Ca. instead of प्रियमेधो?

P. 311. l. 18. (VIII. 2, 40.) The same legend is given Rv. I. 51, 1. काण्वायनं Shad-vinśa-brāhmaṇa. भूत्वाजहार ibid.

P. 315. l. 7. (VIII. 3, 6.) अप्रथयत् deest in A. B I.

P. 317. l. 23. (VIII. 3, 11.) विकल्पनात् ॥ विकर्तनात् A. Ca. विकर्तनात् B I.

P. 319. l. 4. (VIII. 3, 13.) इंद्रस्य लिंगं deest in B I.

P. 323. l. 19. (VIII. 3, 22.) तस्याः by conjecture. तां B 4.; deest in B I.

P. 326. l. 14. (VIII. 4, 3.) संपूर्ण ॥ संपूर्णत्वं A. Ca. and B 4. pr. man. संपूर्णं च B 4. sec. man. and B I.

P. 326. l. 17. (VIII. 4, 3.) एकयत्नेन ॥ एकयत्नेन A. Ca. एकत्वं B 4. एकयत्नैव B I.

P. 326. l. 24. (VIII. 4, 4.) ज्ञेदनाः from Ca. B. A. has a lacuna.

P. 327. l. 26. (VIII. 4, 6.) परस्मैपदं is supplied from C. Mill. The interpretation of यवीयुधा is left out in A. Ca. B I. यवीयुधा वज्रायुधेन युद्धमानेन B 4.

P. 328. l. 26. (VIII. 4, 8.) °प्रवचनीयत्वं ॥ °प्रवचनीयं A. Ca. B.

P. 329. l. 9. (VIII. 4, 8.) अधवी धेद पा पान धेट इच्चैत्यौगोदिको नुप्रत्ययः तत्संनियोगेन इकारांतादेशस्य पानव्याः सोमा इत्यर्थः Ca. after प्रीणयितार इत्यर्थः ।.

P. 331. l. 16. (VIII. 4, 13.) बहुलमिति सप्तम्या अलुक् ॥ बहु लुक् A. बहुलुक् Ca. मिति अलुक् B I.

P. 332. l. 3. (VIII. 4, 14.) गतौ ॥ वा ॥ गंतोवा A. Ca. गंतो वा B I.

P. 332. l. 7. (VIII. 4, 14.) अध्वरं सेवमानाः B I. A. अध्वरे सचमानाः Ca. अध्वरे शोभमानाः B 4.

P. 333. l. 6. (VIII. 4, 16.) तत्कस्य हेतो A. Ca. तत् कस्य हेतोः B I. 4.

P. 334. l. 25. (VII. 4, 20.) शुद्धां भो ॥ शुद्धां भो A. शुद्धां वां भो Ca. शुद्धां B I. 4.

P. 335. l. 2. (VIII. 4, 20.) तत्प्रतिगृहीतं A. तैः प्रतिगृहीतं B I. Ca. प्रतिगृहीतानि?

P. 336. l. 23. (VIII. 5, 2.) नृवर्तौ B I. नेतृवर्तौ A. Ca.

P. 338. l. 21. (VIII. 5, 6.) अपायः ॥ अपायां A. Ca. B I. Some words seem to have been left out.

P. 339. l. 3. (VIII. 5, 7.) कीदृशैः ॥ ईदृशैः A. B I. 4. Ca.

P. 340. l. 4. (VIII. 5, 10.) वा after इति by conjecture.

P. 344. l. 1. (VIII. 5, 22.) यद्यदा deest in A. B. Ca.

P. 347. l. 11. (VIII. 5, 33.) जन्तं deest in A. B. Ca.

- P. 347. l. 18. (VIII. 5, 34.) अस्मिन् B. यस्मिन् A. Ca.  
 P. 348. l. 1. (VIII. 5, 35.) प्रथमांतरमेव सामंतिं Ca. प्रथमांतरमेवसामंतिं A. B I. 4.  
 P. 355. l. 17. (VIII. 6, 19.) Instead of रनां, Sāyana has रनं.  
 P. 357. l. 2. (VIII. 6, 23.) उत प्रजां सुवीर्यं is not explained in A. B. Ca. उतापि च प्रजां सुवीर्यं सुपुत्रवीरं चाद्रियस् B. Taylor.  
 P. 359. l. 6. (VIII. 6, 30.) अस्तमयनं ॥ अस्तमनं A. B. Ca.  
 P. 359. l. 20. (VIII. 6, 32.) सेवस् from B I.  
 P. 360. l. 1. (VIII. 6, 33.) वज्री हस्तः । तद्वान् ॥ वज्रहस्तः तद्वान् A. Ca. वज्रहस्त तद्वानी B I.: cf. Rv. I. 121, 14.  
 P. 362. l. 4. (VIII. 6, 40.) वज्रहस्तेन A. B. Ca. वज्रहतेन?  
 P. 362. l. 27. (VIII. 6, 43.) अत्यष्टोम° A. Ca.; deest in B. अतिष्टोम°?  
 P. 364. l. 3. (VIII. 6, 47.) दशगु° ॥ दशशतगु° A. B. Ca.  
 P. 366. l. 1. (VIII. 7, 5.) यद्यदा by conjecture. नि यत् B. Taylor.  
 P. 369. l. 21. (VIII. 7, 17.) A. Ca. Ba. have immediately after पृश्निमातरः—येनात्मीयेन etc. of the next verse. पृश्निमातरः मरुतः तथा स्तोमैः स्तोत्रैः उदीरते B. Taylor.  
 P. 370. l. 24. (VIII. 7, 22.) प्रवृत्तयज्ञका ॥ प्रवृत्त° A. B. Ca.  
 P. 371. l. 19. (VIII. 7, 22.) च is taken from the Upanishad.  
 P. 372. l. 6. (VIII. 7, 24.) आप्तस्य ॥ आप्तस्य A. Ca. Ba.  
 P. 373. l. 18. (VIII. 7, 28.) समानवाक्ये निघातयुष्मदस्मदादेशा ॥ समानवाक्येषु युष्मदादेशा A. Ca.; deest in B.: cf. Pāṇ. VIII. 1, 18. and Rv. III. 30, 1.  
 P. 373. l. 23. (VIII. 7, 29.) चृजीका नाम B. चृजीका नामा B I. चृजीकानां A. Ca.  
 P. 373. l. 23. (VIII. 7, 29.) तत्संबन्धिनि ॥ तत्संबन्धि A. B. Ca.  
 P. 375. l. 10. (VIII. 7, 33.) आवर्तयामि B 4. आवर्तयामि A. B I. Ca.  
 P. 377. l. 9. (VIII. 8, 1.) स्तोत्रभिः A. B I. Ca. One expects स्तोत्रभ्यः.  
 P. 378. l. 21. (VIII. 8, 5.) पक्षे ॥ यज्ञे A. B I. Ca.  
 P. 380. l. 13. (VIII. 8, 10.) त्रियमाणा ॥ द्वीयमाणा A. Ca. त्रियाणा B I.  
 P. 383. l. 14. (VIII. 8, 12.) अभिप्राप्तावश्रौष्टां ॥ अभिप्राप्ता श्रौष्टां A. Ca. भो श्रेष्टां B I.  
 P. 385. l. 12. (VIII. 8, 23.) तिसंख्या° B. Taylor. संख्या° A. Ca. Ba.  
 P. 387. l. 18. (VIII. 9, 5.) इत्यादिना ॥ इत्यादि A. Ba. Ca.  
 P. 390. l. 1. (VIII. 9, 10.) यद्यथा after युवां from B I.  
 P. 392. l. 21. (VIII. 9, 17.) वा after होतः by conjecture.  
 P. 394. l. 24. (VIII. 10, 4.) अतस्त्रितयादपि स्थानात् । B 4. अतस्त्रितया परिस्थानादपिनात् । B I. अतस्त्रितयादपि नात् । Ca. A.  
 P. 396. l. 1. (VIII. 10, 4.) A. omits all after प्रथवापरहितस्य to the end of the fifth Ashtaka.

*MSS. for the sixth Ashṭaka.*

A. Colebrooke—The text is omitted.

C. Mill, C. Wilson, and Ca. very corrupt.

Ba. (B. Stevenson) and Bb. (B. Taylor) give both only an extract, but B. Taylor contains marginal additions and corrections.

P. 402. l. 3. (VIII. 12, 1.) सोमपानज्ज° B. सोमपानाय ज° A. Ca.

P. 402. l. 19. (VIII. 12, 2.) अपनयनेन Bb. अपनयने A. Ca. Ba. अपनयेन C.

P. 405. l. 3. (VIII. 12, 8.) लुङि सिपि मंत्रे ॥ लुङि सि -- मंत्रे C. लुङि सिमंधेरे A. Ca.

P. 407. l. 3. (VIII. 12, 12.) स्तुत्यगुण° ॥ स्तुत्यागुण° A. B. C. Ca.

P. 407. l. 12. (VIII. 12, 13.) व्यत्ययेन etc. ॥ व्यत्ययेन् परस्य° A. Ca.: cf. Pāṇ. VI. 1, 8, 3.

P. 407. l. 14. (VIII. 12, 13.) हविः is evidently left out after शुद्धं.

P. 410. l. 7. (VIII. 12, 20.) वा after प्राययितारं by conjecture.

P. 410. l. 18. (VIII. 12, 21.) कीर्त्तयः पूर्वीः B. कीर्त्तय विद्या विद्यानि सर्वाणि वसूनि के पूर्वीः A. C. Ca.

P. 412. l. 17. (VIII. 12, 26.) The quotation occurs more complete Rv. I. 55, 2.

P. 416. l. 15. (VIII. 13, 3.) तमे to the end of the verse from Ca. तय वृषे वर्षनार्यं सखा भव B.

P. 416. l. 25. (VIII. 13, 4.) बर्हिषो यज्ञस्य वि राजसि ॥ बर्हिषो यज्ञ वि वा रा° A. Ca. बर्हिषः वेद्या स्तोत्रे बर्हिषि वि र° B.

P. 417. l. 7. (VIII. 13, 5.) ईमहे याचामहे B.

P. 417. l. 8. (VIII. 13, 5.) वेदितारं ॥ विदि° A. Ca.

P. 417. l. 9. (VIII. 13, 5.) आहर B. आहर इति A. Ca.

P. 417. l. 17. (VIII. 13, 6.) Either अकरोत् is left out after °समर्थाः or गृधु प्रसहने should stand immediately after अकरोत्.

P. 419. l. 23. (VIII. 13, 12.) व्याप्तिम् ॥ दीप्तिम्?

P. 421. l. 20. (VIII. 13, 17.) वृक्षस्य शाखा इव from B. Ca.

P. 422. l. 22. (VIII. 13, 20.) ज्ञायते वर्तते ॥ जानन्वर्तते Bb. तानन् वर्तते Ba. जावर्तते A. जान्वर्तते Ca.

P. 422. l. 22. (VIII. 13, 20.) बलिवि° A. Ca. बल° B.

P. 424. l. 13. (VIII. 13, 25.) चृषिभिरुत्पादितभिः by conjecture. चृषिरुत्पादितभिः A. Ca. चृषि -- तत्तितभिः C.

P. 424. l. 23. (VIII. 13, 26.) हेतोः B. हेतुः A. Ca.

P. 425. l. 8. (VIII. 13, 27.) प्राप्तवसू C. Mill. प्रतवसू A. Ca. प्रथितवसू for प्रतवसू?

P. 425. l. 24. (VIII. 13, 29.) स्यः after हिंसित्र्यः A. Ca. Perhaps सयः.

P. 426. l. 2. (VIII. 13, 29.) दक्षावरं A. sec. man. दाक्षावरं Ca. and A. pr. man.

P. 428. l. 25. (VIII. 14, 5.) कृतेति ॥ कृतेति A. Ca.

P. 429. l. 8. (VIII. 14, 6.) After वर्षमानस्य, at the end of the page, several leaves are wanting in Ca., which are supplied by a modern hand. The lacuna extends as far as VIII. 17, 6. The supplementary leaves agree with C.

P. 430. l. 5. (VIII. 14, 9.) दृढीकृतानि ॥ दृढीकृता A. दृ - कृता C.



P. 431. l. 13. (VIII. 14, 13, 14.) The last word of the 13th verse (something like पराजिग्ये) and the beginning of the 14th are wanting in A. C. B. has the following, but put in a wrong place: हे इंद्र मायाभिः उत्सृष्टतः सर्वत्र प्रसरतः द्वां आरुरुक्षतः द्युलोकं आरोहतः दस्युन्.

P. 433. l. 4. (VIII. 15, 3.) शत्रु° ॥ शत्रुहन्नादि° C. शत्रुहर्नादि A. शत्रून् B.: cf. VIII. 15, 11.

P. 433. l. 18. (VIII. 15, 4.) येषां after उग्रशब्दः A. C.

P. 434. l. 2. (VIII. 15, 5.) यद्वा to विशेषण from C.

P. 435. l. 18. (VIII. 15, 10.) स्तोतृत्वमो जज्ञिषे after दातृत्वमो जज्ञिषे C.

P. 435. l. 20. (VIII. 15, 10.) सर्वाणि ॥ सर्वाभ्यो A. सर्वा C. In the second explanation, which was caused by Sáyana's taking मंहिष्ठ in a different meaning, the interpretation of स्वपत्नानि (something like शोभनपुत्रादिभिः सहितानि धनानि) is omitted. यद्वा inserted by conjecture.

P. 438. l. 11. (VIII. 16, 5.) पक्षपातवचनाय only in A.

P. 439. l. 25. (VIII. 16, 11.) अतिपालयतु, at the end, only in A.

P. 440. l. 15. (VIII. 17, 1.) आद्यस्तृचो ॥ आद्या चा° A. आद्या° C.: cf. Rv. I. 7, 1.

P. 441. l. 6. (VIII. 17, 3.) Ca. wanting.

P. 441. l. 21. (VIII. 17, 5.) दक्षिणभेदेन ॥ पेदेन A. पेदेन C. Mill.

P. 441. l. 22. (VIII. 17, 5.) स चासिक्तः wanting in B., placed in A. C. after चेत्.

P. 442. l. 4. (VIII. 17, 6.) Ca. begins again.

P. 443. l. 23. (VIII. 17, 12.) शाचिपूजन ॥ शाचिषा A. Ca.

P. 443. l. 25. (VIII. 17, 12.) यतः by conjecture.

P. 444. l. 5. (VIII. 17, 13.) स्वयमेव ॥ स्वयं ते तव A. Ca.

P. 444. l. 21. (VIII. 17, 14.) °संपादिनां B. °संपादितानां A. Ca.

P. 445. l. 13. (VIII. 18, 1.) द्वाविंशत्यृचं ॥ द्वाविंशर्चं MSS. ut saepe.

P. 445. l. 23. (VIII. 18, 1.) देवादीनां A. Ca.; deest in B. It should be देवानां.

P. 448. l. 17. (VIII. 18, 9.) च वातु अनुवर्ततां B. चानुवर्ततां A. Ca.

P. 449. l. 1. (VIII. 18, 10.) शिष्यते ॥ शिष्टते A. शिष्टते Ca.

P. 450. l. 12. (VIII. 18, 14.) अयमर्थः ॥ अयमर्थः Ca. अमर्थः A.; deest in B.

P. 452. l. 15. (VIII. 18, 20.) स्वामिनां । A. Ca.; deest in B.

P. 453. l. 12. (VIII. 19, 1.) After रा (of राजानां) two leaves are wanting in Ca., which are supplied from another MS. of about the same date.

P. 454. l. 2. (VIII. 19, 1.) लिटि after बहेः C.

P. 454. l. 9. (VIII. 19, 2.) ऋषिः to विभूतरति from B.

P. 454. l. 10. (VIII. 19, 2.) इमं ॥ इंद्रं B.

P. 454. l. 12. (VIII. 19, 2.) नियन्तारं from B.

P. 454. l. 16. (VIII. 19, 5.) यश्च वेदेन to परिचरति from B.

P. 456. l. 21. (VIII. 19, 8.) साधकाः ॥ साधक A. C. रक्षणानि B. instead of धारणानि.

P. 457. l. 14. (VIII. 19, 10.) जयादिकं, and then स तादृशो जनो to the end, from B.

P. 458. l. 24. (VIII. 19, 14.) निशान° ॥ निष्पान° A. Ca.

- P. 459. l. 22. (VIII. 19, 16.) परिचरेमहि from B.
- P. 462. l. 4. (VIII. 19, 22.) प्रयच्छेत्यर्थः A. Ca. प्रयच्छत इत्यर्थः B., which may be right.
- P. 462. l. 5. (VIII. 19, 22.) चाग्निः from B.
- P. 463. l. 12. (VIII. 19, 25.) ये यथा etc. The passage is printed according to A. Ca.; C. Mill has यथापासते तदेव भवतीति । Neither of these readings is right.
- P. 463. l. 13. (VIII. 19, 25.) भवेयमिति ॥ भवति A. Ca.
- P. 463. l. 22. (VIII. 19, 26.) प्रापया after अत एव A. B. Ca.
- P. 465. l. 16. (VIII. 19, 31.) शकटनीडेऽवस्थानात् B. °नीलेऽवस्थान् A. Ca.
- P. 467. l. 2. (VIII. 19, 35.) यजमानेषु from Ca.
- P. 467. l. 18. (VIII. 19, 37.) No commentary is given in A. C. Ca. B. has उताप्येतत्  
यदुक्तं मे मह्यं प्रथियोः अश्वादिषः इयामवशीनां प्रयेता प्रकर्षेण नेता मद्यमदात् क्क पुनरसावदात् सुवास्वाः सुहु निवा-  
सायाः नद्याः अथि तुग्वनि तीर्थेऽथि एतददात् मह्यं सुवास्वु नाम नदी तुग्व तीर्थं भवतीति निरुक्तं अग्रतो गामी भवद्भुः  
भावयता बहूनां पूजितलक्षणः दियानां दानार्हाणां गवां पतिः ताश्च गाः एतत्संख्यायुक्ताः ॥ Cf. Nir. IV. 15.
- P. 468. l. 3. (VIII. 20, 1.) हे प्रस्थावानः to मा from B. मरुत by conjecture.
- P. 468. l. 12. (VIII. 20, 2.) महान्तः ॥ तद्वातः A. Ca. च्चुभुद्धाः is one of the महन्नामानि in  
the Naighantuka.
- P. 468. l. 15. (VIII. 20, 2.) कामयमाना by conjecture; the rest from B.
- P. 468. l. 23. (VIII. 20, 3.) मरुतां to the end from B.
- P. 469. l. 9. (VIII. 20, 4.) दुःखेन युज्यते B. दुःखे ज्यते A. Ca.
- P. 469. l. 12. (VIII. 20, 4.) सर्वोक्तं after पूर्वोक्तं A. Ca.
- P. 470. l. 4. (VIII. 20, 6.) अंत° ॥ अंत° A. B. Ca.
- P. 471. l. 2. (VIII. 20, 8.) चलनाय ॥ Cf. Rv. I. 75, 1, etc.
- P. 471. l. 11. (VIII. 20, 9.) विशेष्यते ॥ विशेषांतो A. विशेषांतौ Ca.
- P. 472. l. 5. (VIII. 20, 11.) शक्तादीन्या° ॥ शक्ताद्यान्या° A. Ca.
- P. 473. l. 8. (VIII. 20, 14.) हीनः ॥ नहिनः A. Ca.; deest in B.
- P. 475. l. 8. (VIII. 20, 19.) शक्तान् ॥ शद्वन् C. सत्कृतन A. Ca. सेकृन् B.
- P. 476. l. 9. (VIII. 20, 22.) रुक्मं after आभरणं A. B. Ca.
- P. 476. l. 13. (VIII. 20, 22.) धारयितव्ये etc. ॥ धारयितव्य स्रोत यज्ञे A. Ca.
- P. 477. l. 6. (VIII. 20, 24.) स्रोतीभिः A. Ca. after कल्याणीभिः.
- P. 478. l. 20. (VIII. 21, 1.) तदानुरूपतृचस्य and अनु रूपतृचस्य repeated in A. Ca.
- P. 480. l. 19. (VIII. 21, 5.) दधिपयसी—उच्यते ॥ दधिपयस्या A. दधिपयस्य Ca. उच्यते A. Ca.
- P. 481. l. 20. (VIII. 21, 7.) सुव्य° ॥ सुव्य° A. Ca.
- P. 481. l. 22. (VIII. 21, 7.) ते त्वां etc. ॥ त त्वं महान्तामिति जानंतो वनंता वयं भवता रक्षंत इति A.  
जानंता Ca.; the rest like A.
- P. 482. l. 4. (VIII. 21, 8.) हे वज्रिन् वज्रिवन् इंद्र B.
- P. 483. l. 3. (VIII. 21, 10.) हरितवशीन्धोपेतं from B.
- P. 483. l. 6. (VIII. 21, 10.) य before एवं सति A. Ca.
- P. 484. l. 15. (VIII. 21, 13.) यत् B. यच्च A. Ca.
- P. 484. l. 25. (VIII. 21, 13.) The end of the commentary which is wanting in

A. Ca. is supplied by B.: यदा मानवस्य नदन्तुं दानादिराहित्यं समूहसि निराकरोषि यष्ट्वं कृणोषि करोषि  
आदिद् अनंतरमेव पितृव सन् तेन हूयसे ॥

P. 485. l. 24. (VIII. 21, 16.) धनादिभिः ॥ नादिभिः A. Ca. आ B.

P. 485. l. 25. (VIII. 21, 16.) कैश्चित् ॥ कश्चित् A. B. Ca.

P. 486. l. 19. (VIII. 21, 18.) वर्तते । तान् ॥ तान् B. त्वत् ततान् A. Ca.

P. 486. l. 19. (VIII. 21, 18.) धनैस्तनोति ॥ धनौ सनोति A. Ca. सनोति B.

P. 487. l. 9. (VIII. 22, 1.) उपक्षपयितारं ॥ उपजनायतारं A. Ca.: cf. दसु उपक्षये.

P. 487. l. 20. (VIII. 22, 2.) युद्धेषु ॥ युक्तेषु A. यक्तेषु Ca.

P. 488. l. 14. (VIII. 22, 4.) मंत्रांतरं ॥ मंत्रांतरं सति A. Ca.

P. 489. l. 13. (VIII. 22, 6.) वृकेण वृको लांगलं etc. ॥ वृकेण लांगलेखनं कुरुषः । शुभस्यती उदकस्य  
पालयिता भवति । विकर्त्तनादिति यास्कः । तेन लांगलेन यवनामकं धनं वां कर्षयः । पुनश्च तस्मै विलेखनं कुरुषः ।  
शुभस्यती etc. A. Ca. वृकेण लांगलेन यवनामकं धनं वां कर्षयः C. वृकेण लांगलेन यवं यवनामकं धान्यं  
कर्षयः । पुनश्च तस्मै etc. B. The confusion in A. Ca. arises from the copyist having  
originally skipped a line after लेखनं कुरुषः.

P. 489. l. 15. (VIII. 22, 6.) यज्ञदिने B. पञ्चदिने A. Ca.

P. 489. l. 23. (VIII. 22, 7.) अस्मान् ॥ अस्माकं A. B. Ca.

P. 489. l. 23. (VIII. 22, 7.) आगच्छतं B. गच्छतौ A. Ca.

P. 490. l. 25. (VIII. 22, 10.) अवयः to राजानं from B.

P. 491. l. 10. (VIII. 22, 11.) अघृतगमनाः ॥ अघृतधनाः A. B. Ca.

P. 491. l. 25. (VIII. 22, 12.) वंदनो मायाभिः ॥ वंदनमालाभिः A. Ca.

P. 492. l. 18. (VIII. 22, 14.) स्तूयमानमार्गौ ॥ स्तूयमार्गौ A. Ca.

P. 492. l. 21. (VIII. 22, 14.) रुद्रौ उग्रौ B.

P. 493. l. 3. (VIII. 22, 15.) सचनीय° ॥ सेचनीय° A. B. Ca. सचनी° C. Mill. The right  
reading is probably सचन°.

P. 493. l. 15. (VIII. 22, 16.) ऊतिभी रक्षाभिः from B.

P. 494. l. 7. (VIII. 22, 18.) प्रयच्छति ॥ प्रच्छति A. Ca.; deest in B.

P. 494. l. 9. (VIII. 22, 18.) त्वन्नो B. C. त्वभो A. Ca.

P. 497. l. 1. (VIII. 23, 7.) हे देवाः B. before चषणीनां.

P. 497. l. 1. (VIII. 23, 7.) यष्ट्वेन ॥ यष्ट्वेन B. यष्ट्रं यष्ट्वेन A. Ca.

P. 497. l. 10. (VIII. 23, 8.) धत्तयज्ञं प्रति ॥ धत्तयज्ञं प्रति A. Ca. यज्ञं प्रति B. धत्तयज्ञं C. Mill.

P. 499. l. 22. (VIII. 23, 15.) माययापि तस्य ॥ मायापि तस्य A. Ca. मापितस्य B.

P. 500. l. 15. (VIII. 23, 17.) गृह ॥ सह A. B. Ca.

P. 503. l. 2. (VIII. 23, 24.) °परिहारेण ॥ °परिपूरेण A. Ca.

P. 503. l. 21. (VIII. 23, 26.) मानुषाणां after मानुषा A. Ca.

P. 504. l. 21. (VIII. 23, 29.) प्रदातासि from B.

P. 505. l. 26. (VIII. 24, 1.) इत्थ° ॥ इति° A. Ca.

P. 506. l. 18. (VIII. 24, 3.) नानाविधानोषेतं ॥ नानाविधानोषेतं A. Ca. B.

P. 506. l. 18. (VIII. 24, 3.) आ before संपादय, meant for आहर, A. Ca. आ सपा C. Mill.

P. 507. l. 1. (VIII. 24, 4.) निरेकं a second time by conjecture.

P. 507. l. 26. (VIII. 24, 6.) तथा मनो by conjecture.

P. 509. l. 3. (VIII. 24, 9.) नर्तयि° ॥ वर्तयि° A. B. Ca.

P. 510. l. 10. (VIII. 24, 12.) यशसे deest in B.

P. 511. l. 18. (VIII. 24, 15.) स्तुतिकर्मा C. कर्मा A. Ca.

P. 512. l. 3. (VIII. 24, 16.) The explanation of सदावृधः from B.

P. 512. l. 11. (VIII. 24, 17.) उपलक्ष्यं ॥ पलक्ष्यं A. Ca. The true reading would be उपलक्ष्यमेतत्.

P. 512. l. 12. (VIII. 24, 17.) छांदस आंगमः ॥ छांदसो वोम A. Ca.

P. 512. l. 13. (VIII. 24, 17.) सर्वैः ॥ वै A. Ca.

P. 512. l. 26. (VIII. 24, 18.) A. Ca. have a lacuna after आह्या-, which extends to verse 23. This lacuna is supplied in Ca. by another hand, apparently copying from C. Mill, which here agrees in all material points with B.

P. 514. l. 12. (VIII. 24, 21.) Ca. (in the supplementary leaf) adds at the end, यद्वा येन दत्तं धनं सर्वं शत्रुजनमभिभवति येन दत्तं धनमादायसतः शत्रून् अभिभवतीत्यर्थः ॥

P. 515. l. 5. (VIII. 24, 23.) दशधा A. Ca. दशमो?

P. 515. l. 13. (VIII. 24, 24.) संबोधाह ॥ संबोध्य A. Ca.

P. 515. l. 16. (VIII. 24, 24.) भवन्तीति ॥ भवन्ति A. Ca.

P. 515. l. 16. (VIII. 24, 24.) यजमानानामिव ॥ यजमानानाम्रा A. Ca.

P. 515. l. 17. (VIII. 24, 24.) परिपदां समानाधिकरणः ॥ परिपदी समानक A. Ca.

P. 516. l. 21. (VIII. 24, 27.) चृन् etc. ॥ चृन् मनुष्यान् चृणोते° A. Ca. नृन् मनुष्यान् छणोति B.

P. 516. l. 23. (VIII. 24, 27.) किं पुनः तं ॥ किं पुना A. Ca. किं पुनर्हतीत्यर्थः B.

P. 517. l. 17. (VIII. 24, 28.) प्रापितवत्यसि ॥ प्रापितवानसि A. Ca.

P. 517. l. 19. (VIII. 24, 28.) करोषि ॥ करोति A. Ca.

P. 517. l. 25. (VIII. 24, 29.) आदत्तवान् ॥ दत्तवान् A. Ca.

P. 518. l. 13. (VIII. 24, 30.) यदा ॥ यथा A. Ca.

P. 518. l. 18. (VIII. 25, 1.) -स्तिस्रो to उष्णिग्गभी supplied from C. B.

P. 520. l. 16. (VIII. 25, 5.) बलाद्वेग ॥ बलाहेग A. Ca. They are the grandsons of बल (शवस्), and वेग proceeds from बल.

P. 520. l. 17. (VIII. 25, 5.) वास्तुस्या after वास्तु A. Ca.; not in C.

P. 521. l. 4. (VIII. 25, 6.) वृष्यवेला तदा ॥ वृष्यवेजानाद A. Ca.

P. 522. l. 6. (VIII. 25, 9.) B. has अनुस्वनेन अग्नेः तेजवत् दुःसहेन चक्षसा व्याघ्रतेजसौ ॥

P. 522. l. 7. (VIII. 25, 9.) होतव्योः ॥ होताव्योः A. Ca.; not in B. होतव्योः?

P. 523. l. 7. (VIII. 25, 12.) पालनवत्त्वात् ॥ पालनैवत्त्वात् A. Ca.

P. 523. l. 10. (VIII. 25, 12.) कर्म ॥ कर्मक A. Ca.

P. 524. l. 23. (VIII. 25, 16.) व्रतानि कर्माणि B. प्रति कर्मणा A. Ca.

P. 525. l. 15. (VIII. 25, 18.) तयोः पर्यैतान् ॥ तयोः पतयित्वा A. Ca. तयोः अंतरान् B. B. has अंतरान्, as an explanation of अंतान्, in the beginning of the verse.

P. 525. l. 24. (VIII. 25, 19.) रूपं by conjecture.

P. 526. l. 6. (VIII. 25, 20.) One expects तस्मिन् before वचः.

- P. 526. l. 18. (VIII. 25, 21.) लुक् ॥ षष्ठी A. Ca.
- P. 527. l. 3. (VIII. 25, 22.) उच्चण् ॥ उच्चण A. Ca. Cases where the base of a noun is thus quoted are not unfrequent in Sáyana.
- P. 527. l. 3. (VIII. 25, 22.) वृद्धि° ॥ वृद्ध° A. pr. man. वृद्ध° Ca. and A. margin.
- P. 527. l. 16. (VIII. 25, 23.) नु कुशलं ॥ खकुशलं A. Ca.
- P. 527. l. 17. (VIII. 25, 23.) आयुध° ॥ अधुय A. Ca.
- P. 527. l. 18. (VIII. 25, 23.) भवेतां ॥ भवेन A. Ca.; deest in B.
- P. 527. l. 26. (VIII. 25, 24.) उचितौ ॥ अस्थितौ (अनिष्ठितौ) A. Ca.
- P. 528. l. 3. (VIII. 25, 24.) अग्रहीषं ॥ अग्रहीतं A. B. Ca.
- P. 529. l. 3. (VIII. 26, 2.) तनं ॥ A. Ca.
- P. 530. l. 9. (VIII. 26, 5.) रोदनशीलौ रुवंतौ वा ॥ रोदनशीले दवसौ वा A. Ca. रोदनशीलौ B.
- P. 530. l. 10. (VIII. 26, 5.) संक्षेपयतं etc. ॥ सकेदयतं । हतमित्यर्थः । पशु हिंसासंकेदनयोरिति क A. Ca.; cf. Dhátup. XVII. 55.
- P. 530. l. 20. (VIII. 26, 6.) मादनशील etc. ॥ मादनशीलवंशरीरकांती ये युवां रूपं पश्यन्ति वेतुतत्वेन A. Ca.
- P. 531. l. 7. (VIII. 26, 7.) तैरप° ॥ तैरुप° A. तैरुप Ca. केनापि च्यावनीयौ B.
- P. 532. l. 12. (VIII. 26, 10.) °गवामपनेतृन् ॥ गवामानेतृन् B. गवासानेतृन् A. Ca.
- P. 532. l. 21. (VIII. 26, 11.) आत्मायन्नतया ॥ आत्मायांतया A. Ca.
- P. 534. l. 15. (VIII. 26, 16.) क्रतौ and इति after हवानां by conjecture.
- P. 535. l. 3. (VIII. 26, 17.) समनुष्णौ ॥ मनुष्णौ A. Ca.
- P. 536. l. 3. (VIII. 26, 20.) कर° ॥ करललास्फालनैराश्वाश्चपेषणीया A. Ca. भुजास्फालन° Rv. III. 36, 4.
- P. 536. l. 8. (VIII. 26, 21.) A. Ca. leave out the verses and mark a lacuna. The Viníyoga is given from Áśval. III. 8.
- P. 536. l. 23. (VIII. 26, 22.) After अभिषुत a lacuna in A. Ca., supplied from B.
- P. 537. l. 9. (VIII. 26, 23.) सर्वतो दिक्षु ॥ °दिक्कं A. Ca. °दिक्षु B., C. Mill.
- P. 537. l. 9. (VIII. 26, 23.) अश्वावावह ॥ अश्वावाह A. Ca.
- P. 537. l. 19. (VIII. 26, 24.) सुप्त A. Ca.; deest in B.
- P. 537. l. 23. (VIII. 26, 24.) न । यथा and afterwards ग्रावाणं from B.
- P. 540. l. 9. (VIII. 27, 4.) वा after सर्वज्ञा by conjecture.
- P. 540. l. 20. (VIII. 27, 5.) शुश्रूषतया प्राप्तव्येत्यर्थः । तया ॥ शुश्रूषतया प्राप्तव्येत्येत्यर्थः । गतया Ca. A. ज्ञापन प्राप्तव्येत्येत्यर्थः । गतया C. Mill. प्राप्तव्यतया गतया B. The reading is very doubtful.
- P. 540. l. 22. (VIII. 27, 5.) सदनं पदन A. Ca.
- P. 542. l. 22. (VIII. 27, 9.) शिच्त्वात् and शिच् ॥ शिस्त्वात् and शिङ् A. Ca.; cf. Dhátup. §. 34.
- P. 544. l. 7. (VIII. 27, 12.) वा before व्यत्येन A. Ca.
- P. 545. l. 2. (VIII. 27, 14.) स्परं by conjecture.
- P. 545. l. 12. (VIII. 27, 15.) °माणास्मात् ॥ °माणास्मत् A. Ca.
- P. 546. l. 23. (VIII. 27, 18.) चतुर्गमने प्रत्ये by conjecture. चत्त्र is explained as पर्वत or मेघ. चतुर्गमनप्रेरन् A. Ca. Probably some omission has taken place, and रन् formed part of a grammatical explanation.

P. 547. l. 11. (VIII. 27, 19.) धनं मनवे ॥ धने मध्ये A. Ca.

P. 548. l. 19. (VIII. 27, 22.) प्राप्नुमः A. Ca. is a mistake for प्राप्नुयाम.

P. 551. l. 9. (VIII. 29, 1.) °देवतं ॥ °देवताः A. Ca.

P. 551. l. 10. (VIII. 29, 1.) सोम्यं A. Ca. सौम्यं?

P. 551. l. 10. (VIII. 29, 1.) शवल° ॥ सवल° A. Ca. B.

P. 551. l. 12. (VIII. 29, 1.) किरणैस्त्वावदुद्धते चंद्रमसि दुःखोपशमनानि ॥ किरणैः तावपुदते चंद्रमसि सर्व-  
स्वदुःखापशमनेन A. and Ca. The copyist of Ca., however, seems to have written तावपुदते.  
सर्वस्व is only an erroneous repetition of सर्वस्व.

P. 551. l. 13. (VIII. 29, 1.) रात्रयश्चंद्रनेतृकाः ॥ रात्रयः चंद्रनेतृकाः A. Ca.

P. 553. l. 3. (VIII. 29, 6.) यथा before चोरः repeated by conjecture.

P. 553. l. 4. (VIII. 29, 6.) तस्य before सहायेभ्यो A. Ca.; deest in B.; perhaps स्वसहाये°.  
स्वसहायेभ्यो C.

P. 554. l. 2. (VIII. 29, 9.) द्वा द्वौ to अत्रयः from Ca. The beginning of the tenth  
verse is wanting in A. Ca. एके अत्रयः महि महत् साम त्रिवृत्यं च दशादि मन्वत अमन्यत तदेव अर्चतः  
पूजयंतः यतादृशाः अतादृशाः etc. B.

P. 554. l. 17. (VIII. 30, 1.) शिशुर्नास्ति ॥ शिशुर्नास्ति खलु B. शिनास्ति कल्पनया नास्तीत्यर्थः A. Ca.  
कल्यांतता?

P. 555. l. 4. (VIII. 30, 2.) लेटि—लुग° ॥ लोटि—नुग° A. Ca.

P. 555. l. 13. (VIII. 30, 3.) धनादिमंतश्च ॥ धनादि मंतश्च A. Ca.

P. 555. l. 14. (VIII. 30, 3.) मानवात्पित्र्यात् etc. ॥ मानवान् मनुः सर्वेषां मनुः पिता नत आगत् (आग-  
तात् Ca.) परावतेः पिता मुहुर् मार्गे चक्रे तस्मात्पथो etc. A. Ca. मानवात् पित्र्यात् सर्वेषां मनुः पिता ततः  
आगतात् परावतः दूरात् पथः मार्गात् etc. B.

P. 555. l. 17. (VIII. 30, 3.) अस्मानपनयत ॥ मास्मानपनयत A. Ca. तस्मात् मार्गात् अपनयत । B.

P. 555. l. 25. (VIII. 30, 4.) विश्वानरोऽग्निः ॥ वैश्वा° A. Ca.

P. 557. l. 8. (VIII. 31, 3.) दीप्तिमान् रथो रंहणशीलः etc. ॥ द्युमान् दीप्तिमान् रथः असत् B. द्युमान्  
दीप्तिमान् शीलो स्यंदनः देवानां हविः प्रदानरूपेण यू—यज्ञेन Ca. A. agrees with Ca., but has only  
न् instead of दीप्तिमान्.

P. 557. l. 12. (VIII. 31, 3.) येन मे रथो ॥ यो है म रथै A. Ca. हैमरथै C. Mill. Very doubtful.

P. 557. l. 17. (VIII. 31, 4.) After शीलं A. Ca. have यतीत्यर्थः, C. Mill तीत्यर्थः ॥

P. 557. l. 18. (VIII. 31, 4.) धेनुः before धिनोति A. Ca.

P. 557. l. 19. (VIII. 31, 4.) दिवेदिवे etc. ॥ दिवे दिवैर्दुहते A. Ca. दिवेदिवे दुहे देवैः दुहते B.

P. 558. l. 5. (VIII. 31, 5.) अन्नादीन् A. Ca. दीनि B. Immediately afterwards all MSS.  
have again अन्नादीन्, though it is grammatically wrong.

P. 558. l. 12. (VIII. 31, 6.) प्रशय्यान् ॥ A. Ca. B. प्राशितय्यान्?

P. 558. l. 15. (VIII. 31, 6.) A. Ca. have सुप्यत इत्यर्थः after न गच्छतः ॥

P. 558. l. 19. (VIII. 31, 7.) नापिदुतः ॥ अपिदुतः A. B. Ca.

P. 559. l. 4. (VIII. 31, 8.) तत्रापि A. B. Ca.

P. 559. l. 23. (VIII. 31, 10.) स्वर्गपुष्पफल° A. स्वर्गफलपुष्प Ca. फलपुष्प° B.

P. 559. l. 24. (VIII. 31, 10.) युक्तानां from B. स्वर्ग seems a later addition.

- P. 560. l. 1. (VIII. 31, 10.) भवतो ॥ भवय A. Ca. सहितस्य B.
- P. 561. l. 6. (VIII. 31, 10.) क्षेत्रो A. B. Ca.
- P. 561. l. 16. (VIII. 31, 15.) तद्वत् । यो देवानां from B.
- P. 562. l. 1. (VIII. 31, 16.) देवानां मन इयक्षति ॥ देवानां न इयक्षति Ca. न इयक्षति A. हे यजमान यः हविर्भिः देवानां मनः इयक्षति B.
- P. 562. l. 22. (VIII. 31, 18.) आशु° by conjecture.
- P. 563. l. 14. (VIII. 32, 1.) A. Ca. have between मादूनं and प्र कृतानि the passage which is inserted after °स्थाने to तृचौ । आ° ८. १२. । इति ॥
- P. 563. l. 16. (VIII. 32, 1.) अच्चावाकवादे etc. ॥ अच्चावाकः पत्नीयजमानस्यान A. आच्चादको पत्नी-यजमानस्यान Ca. Instead of पत्नीयजमानस्यान we expect प्रयत्ना इत्यस्य तृचस्य स्थाने. Cf. Rv. VIII. 60, 10.
- P. 565. l. 20. (VIII. 32, 9.) अश्विनोऽश्वयुक्तान् कृधि from B.
- P. 565. l. 21. (VIII. 32, 9.) धनवतश्च C. मेघवतश्च A. Ca. धनिनश्च B.
- P. 566. l. 10. (VIII. 32, 11.) इदं to एव from B.
- P. 566. l. 23. (VIII. 32, 13.) शोभनपारणश्च ॥ शोभनवरणश्च A. Ca. शोभनाचरणश्च B. शोभनवर्णश्च C. Mill. Cf. Rv. III. 50, 3; III. 39, 8.
- P. 567. l. 18. (VIII. 32, 16.) ब्रह्मचारि ॥ ब्रह्मसूचारि Ca. and A. pr. man.? ब्रह्मचारि A. sec. man.
- P. 567. l. 23. (VIII. 32, 17.) Ca. omits all from the first स्तुत्य एवेन्द्र to ब्रह्मणि ; the lacuna is supplied in A. in the margin. B. has an independent explanation.
- P. 570. l. 24. (VIII. 32, 29.) From सोमरूप° to सोमपे° in the 30th verse taken from B. A. Ca. mark a lacuna.
- P. 571. l. 14. (VIII. 33, 1.) सूत्रितं च to अनु रूपः from Ca. and C. Mill. There is still some mistake, as the third Vinīyoga refers to the first.
- P. 572. l. 13. (VIII. 33, 3.) देहि from B.
- P. 573. l. 14. (VIII. 33, 6.) अपवृतः ॥ अवृतः A. Ca. आवृतः B. अपवृतः A. by correction in the margin.
- P. 573. l. 15. (VIII. 33, 6.) अयः ॥ अवं A. Ca.; deest in C. Mill.
- P. 573. l. 26. (VIII. 33, 7.) पुष्टः शत्रुपुष्टिणि B.
- P. 574. l. 24. (VIII. 33, 10.) वृषभिश्च ॥ वृषाश्च Ca. वृषांश्च A. वृषैश्च B.
- P. 575. l. 7. (VIII. 33, 11.) अश्वरक्षणाः A. B. Ca.
- P. 578. l. 8. (VIII. 34, 1.) वसुरोचिषो B. वसुमहोविनो A. Ca.
- P. 578. l. 19. (VIII. 34, 1.) स्वर्गे B. -- स्वर्गे A. कुर्वस्वर्गे Ca. C.
- P. 580. l. 1. (VIII. 34, 6.) The commentary to this verse is taken from B.; left out in A. Ca.
- P. 581. l. 10. (VIII. 34, 10.) अयेश्वर । A. B. Ca.
- P. 581. l. 18. (VIII. 34, 11.) उपश्रुत्युपश्रुतौ ॥ उपश्रुति उपश्रुतेः A. उपश्रुते Ca. उपश्रुति B.
- P. 582. l. 16. (VIII. 34, 14.) धनानि is probably omitted after वा.
- P. 582. l. 22. (VIII. 34, 15.) वसूनि A. Ca. वसूनि B.
- P. 583. l. 12. (VIII. 34, 18.) वनस्पतयो before वनस्य A. Ca.

## VARIETAS LECTONIS.

- P. 583. l. 12. (VIII. 34, 18.) आतिष्ठमिति ॥ आतिष्ठति A. Ca. आतिष्ठ B.
- P. 584. l. 16. (VIII. 35, 3.) The commentary on this, the following, and the 6th verses is supplied from B.
- P. 586. l. 13. (VIII. 35, 9.) गगणं ॥ गगनं B. वा गगनं A. Ca.
- P. 589. l. 22. (VIII. 35, 20.) सर्गाणि B. सर्गाणि A. Ca. वस्त्राणि in the margin of A., marked to be inserted after सर्गाणि.
- P. 590. l. 6. (VIII. 35, 21.) युञ्जान् in the margin of A. after अध्वरान्.
- P. 590. l. 24. (VIII. 35, 23.) यज्ञे ॥ यज्ञ A. Ca.; deest in B.
- P. 592. l. 8. (VIII. 36, 2.) रक्ष ॥ रक्षसि A. B. Ca.
- P. 593. l. 23. (VIII. 36, 7.) प्राविष ॥ प्रवस्यमाविष A. Ca. पुरुकुत्सं पुत्रं प्राविष रक्षिष B.
- P. 595. l. 21. (VIII. 37, 6.) भवसि चव° । A. Ca. B. अवसि चव° C. Mill.
- P. 596. l. 4. (VIII. 37, 7.) क्षत्राणि बलानि कामैर्विधेयन् from B.
- P. 596. l. 11. (VIII. 38, 1.) °स्तोत्रियसंज्ञकस्तुचः ॥ स्तोत्रियसंज्ञक A. Ca.: cf. Rv. VI. 60, 7.
- P. 596. l. 13. (VIII. 38, 1.) °नीयस्य ॥ नीय° A. Ca.
- P. 599. l. 12. (VIII. 39, 2.) रराच्यां Pada Taylor, Pada Mill sec. man. अराच्यां Pada Mill pr. man. and A. B. Ca. in the commentary.
- P. 601. l. 14. (VIII. 39, 7.) अपि ॥ अप्या A. Ca.
- P. 601. l. 23. (VIII. 39, 8.) After समनानुषः B. adds समहोत.
- P. 602. l. 23. (VIII. 40, 1.) ऊरुभाग ॥ उरुभीग A. Ca. उदनीयं C. Mill.
- P. 603. l. 1. (VIII. 40, 1.) होतकाः खाशस्त्रे C. Mill. होतका खाशस्त्रे Ca. क खो A.
- P. 603. l. 1. (VIII. 40, 1.) आरंभणीयाभ्य ॥ आरंभणीयारभ्य A. Ca. and C. Mill.
- P. 603. l. 12. (VIII. 40, 1.) दत्तं from B.
- P. 604. l. 17. (VIII. 40, 4.) हे नाभाक नभाकवत् ॥ हे नभाकवत् B. हे नाभाक नभाकवंतौ A. Ca. हे नाभाक नाभाकवंतौ C. Mill.
- P. 605. l. 9. (VIII. 40, 6.) वत्स्या ॥ वत्याः B. तमाया A. Ca.
- P. 605. l. 22. (VIII. 40, 7.) वनुयाम च स्तुमः B.
- P. 606. l. 13. (VIII. 40, 9.) वस्तो वा A. Ca.
- P. 606. l. 15. (VIII. 40, 9.) पूर्वीः । या etc. ॥ पूर्वीर्वयः प्रज्ञां साधंतासाधयन् A. Ca. पूर्वीः बह्वयः प्रज्ञाः नः याः धियः अस्मद्बुद्धयः नु क्षिप्रं साधंत साधयंतु ॥ B.
- P. 608. l. 10. (VIII. 41, 1.) After रक्षति B. adds यथा गोपालो गा रक्षति तद्वत्.
- P. 608. l. 19. (VIII. 41, 2.) समीप उदये उदञ्छति A. B. Ca. Sáyana takes उदये for a verbal form, and, if so, the relative pronoun must be inserted.
- P. 609. l. 9. (VIII. 41, 3.) त्रिषु A. B. Ca. One expects त्रिषु --- कालेषु.
- P. 609. l. 17. (VIII. 41, 4.) After निर्माता B. begins a new sentence with तस्य वरुणस्य.
- P. 609. l. 18. (VIII. 41, 4.) स्वकृतं B. स्वतुतं A. खनुतं Ca.
- P. 609. l. 19. (VIII. 41, 4.) रक्षिता ॥ ररक्षति Ca. ररक्षति A. रक्षति B.
- P. 610. l. 13. (VIII. 41, 6.) त्रितं भूर्भुव स्वः त्रिस्थानं । B.
- P. 610. l. 24. (VIII. 41, 7.) A. Ca. mark a lacuna. यः वरुणः आसु दिक्षु अत्र व्याघ्रः सन्



## VARIETAS LECTIONIS.

आशये जाग्रतो वर्तते यः वरुणः रथां शत्रूणां विश्वा सर्वाणि परि जातानि परितो भूतानि धामानि पुराणि  
मर्मुशत् विनाशयत् अस्य वरुणस्य पुरो गये रथस्य पुरस्तात् विश्वे सर्वे etc. B.

P. 611. l. 17. (VIII. 41, 9.) अंतरिक्षेऽधि वसतः ॥ अंतरिक्षाधिच्युतः A. Ca. अंतरिक्षेऽधि विश्वतानि B.

P. 611. l. 18. (VIII. 41, 9.) तिस्रो भूमीरधिस्थिता A. Ca. तिस्रो भूमिः द्यौरंतरिक्षं भूमीः तिरुत्तराणि  
तिसृणां अधिस्थितानि B.

P. 613. l. 4. (VIII. 42, 1.) B. has विश्वेत् बहूनि संति ॥

P. 616. l. 7. (VIII. 43, 4.) पृथगिति etc. ॥ पृथगित्यनेन सममर्थ्यगिति पृथगितोव वाज° Ca. and A.  
pr. man. पृथगित्यनेन सममर्थ्यं गिति । पृथगित्येव वाज° A. by correction. The Vāj. Sanh., in  
Weber's edition, has वृथक्.

P. 617. l. 5. (VIII. 43, 8.) After ज्वलन् B. has भस्मत्पुल्य भवन् ।

P. 617. l. 23. (VIII. 43, 11.) सोमधृत° ॥ सौमधृते° A. Ca. सोमधृते B.

P. 620. l. 8. (VIII. 43, 21.) प्रभु प्रभुः Ca. प्रभुः प्रभुः A. प्रभुः प्रभु प्रभुः B. The MSS. of the  
text have here and Rv. VIII. 11, 8, where the same verse occurs, प्रभुः.

P. 620. l. 11. (VIII. 43, 21.) अनु by conjecture.

P. 622. l. 12. (VIII. 43, 30.) गाह° ॥ ग्राहयितव्यानि A. B. Ca.

P. 627. l. 24. (VIII. 44, 19.) वर्षयंतु ॥ वर्षयंति A. B. Ca. The same occurs frequently;  
see Rv. VIII. 44, 22.

P. 629. l. 24. (VIII. 44, 28.) तं सुख्य वा ॥ तसुयवा A. Ca.; deest in B.

P. 633. l. 23. (VIII. 45, 13.) भंक्तारं ॥ भोक्तारं A. B. Ca.

P. 634. l. 4. (VIII. 45, 14.) पणमानं A. Ca. पणिनामानं B.

P. 636. l. 7. (VIII. 45, 23.) मनुष्या A. मनुष्याणां B. Ca. and A. pr. man.

P. 636. l. 21. (VIII. 45, 25.) प्रेरितवान् ॥ प्रेरयितवान् A. B. Ca.

P. 637. l. 19. (VIII. 45, 29.) चुबुरेति A. चुबुरेति Ca. The Naighanṭuka I. 12. in Roth's  
edition has चुबुरे and, as a various reading, चुबुरः.

P. 638. l. 9. (VIII. 45, 31.) किं नाकाषीः ॥ किं माकाषीः A. B. Ca.

P. 640. l. 6. (VIII. 45, 38.) The end of the commentary is left out in A. Ca. It  
is supplied in B. in the following way: असिन्वन् अवधन् अग्नीव कितव इव स सोमः त्वामेव प्राप्नः  
आवयः दृश्यमानाः सर्वे देवाः निवत्ता अधोमुखाः संतः आचरन् निर्गताः.

P. 640. l. 19. (VIII. 45, 40.) हिंस च । तासां ॥ हिंस्य तस्तासां A. हिंस्य त । तस्तासां Ca. हिंस्यतः तासां B.

P. 640. l. 24. (VIII. 45, 41.) विमर्शेनक्षमे ॥ विमर्शके न क्षमे A. Ca. विमर्षके न क्षमे B. See  
Benfey, Glossary to Sāma-veda, s. v. *parśāna*. The intended interpretation seems  
to have been “able to withstand friction or a blow;” *vimrś* being used in the  
sense of *āmrś*.

P. 641. l. 23. (VIII. 46, 1.) अष्टाक्षरा ॥ अष्टाक्षरवती A. B. C.

P. 641. l. 23. (VIII. 46, 1.) °चतुर्थयोद्धा° ॥ °तृतीययोद्धा° A. B. Ca.

P. 642. l. 17. (VIII. 46, 1.) The wording of the Sarvānukramanī is difficult, and  
therefore the MSS. vary. उपरिग्राहृहतीवृहत्सौ must be taken as a Dvandva, compre-  
hending verses 18 and 19; उन्नरा is a dual belonging to पंक्ती. MS. E. I. H. 132. reads  
उन्नरा पंक्तिः संस्तारपंक्तिः ।

P. 645. l. 7. (VIII. 46, 9.) अवध्यः अवधीयः दयः B. after तारकः. The substantive omitted is मदः.

P. 645. l. 13. (VIII. 46, 10.) इति निपातानिपातद्वय° ॥ इति निपातानिपातद्वय° A. Ca. निपातानिपातद्वय° A. sec. man. अनिपात, if the reading be right, must be taken in the sense of पद.

P. 647. l. 8. (VIII. 46, 15.) महं, instead of मन, A. B. Ca.

P. 647. l. 9. (VIII. 46, 15.) Sáyana seems to have read अद्य instead of अय. A. has अयेदानीं by correction.

P. 647. l. 11. (VIII. 46, 15.) लिङ्भावात् A. Ca. One expects लिङ्भावात्.

P. 647. l. 20. (VIII. 46, 16.) अथापि इदानीमपि A. Ca. अथापि इदानीमपि A. by correction. अय इति चित् अनंतरमपि B. Here also Sáyana seems to have read अयय or अयद्य instead of अयय ।.

P. 648. l. 4. (VIII. 46, 17.) वा after एव by conjecture.

P. 649. l. 6. (VIII. 46, 20.) सुसन्नितः सुष्ठु संभक्तः B. after संभक्तः.

P. 649. l. 7. (VIII. 46, 20.) वा ॥ त्वा A. Ca.

P. 649. l. 17. (VIII. 46, 21.) वशायाश्चाय ॥ वशायाख्याय A. Ca.

P. 649. l. 17. (VIII. 46, 21.) कानीतस्तु MS. of the Bṛihaddevatā. कानीतस्य A. Ca.

P. 649. l. 22. (VIII. 46, 21.) कानीते पुत्रे कन्यायाः A. Ca. कानीते कनीतपुत्रे कन्यायाः A. by correction in the margin. कानीते कानीतपुत्रे कन्यायाः पुत्रे B.

P. 650. l. 2. (VIII. 46, 22.) Both Pada and Sanhitā MSS. read here उद्धानां ।. See Prātiśākhya I. 357.

P. 650. l. 16. (VIII. 46, 23.) आशवः A. B. Ca. instead of अश्वाः.

P. 651. l. 12. (VIII. 46, 25.) धनस्य ॥ धन A. B. Ca.

P. 651. l. 21. (VIII. 46, 26.) सा before संख्या from B.

P. 651. l. 21. (VIII. 46, 26.) °नां त्रिः to सोमसुद्धिः सोम° from the margin of A. B. (Taylor) makes the same addition in the margin from त्रिः to पृष्ठ°.

P. 652. l. 9. (VIII. 46, 27.) अन्वशात् ॥ अन्वप्सन् Ca. अतप्सन् A.

P. 652. l. 25. (VIII. 46, 29.) अद्वेयं । A. B. Ca.

P. 654. l. 9. (VIII. 46, 33.) योज्य A. Ca. See Pāṇ. VII. 1, 38; Benfey, §. 915; M. Bhār. I. 3582.

P. 654. l. 14. (VIII. 47, 1.) लैंगिकः by conjecture.

P. 655. l. 8. (VIII. 47, 2.) यथा from B.

P. 655. l. 18. (VIII. 47, 3.) पक्षा वयो न is not explained again in A. Ca. त वयो न यक्षा पक्षिणः शिशुकानां पक्षोपरि यथा तथा वि यंतन etc. B.

P. 656. l. 12. (VIII. 47, 5.) अवैदधि° ॥ अवइधि° A. Ca. अव इति धि° C. Mill.

P. 656. l. 22. (VIII. 47, 6.) Sáyana explains आशवः instead of आश वः.

P. 656. l. 23. (VIII. 47, 6.) यं after यूयं by conjecture.

P. 657. l. 9. (VIII. 47, 7.) प्रवृद्धं परिहारार्थं ॥ अप्रवृद्धं अपरिहारार्थं A. Ca. प्रवृद्धं अपरिहारार्थं C. अभिप्रवृद्धं अपरिहारार्थं B. अपरिहारार्थं?

P. 658. l. 5. (VIII. 47, 9.) कस्य ॥ यस्य A. B. Ca.

- P. 659. l. 26. (VIII. 47, 14.) °शेषेण ॥ °शेषे A. Ca.  
 P. 661. l. 7. (VIII. 47, 16.) यदेव ॥ तदेव A. B. Ca.  
 P. 661. l. 8. (VIII. 47, 16.) भोक्ता इत्यर्थः ॥ भोक्तुरित्यर्थः । A. B. Ca.  
 P. 661. l. 9. (VIII. 47, 16.) यदेवापः ॥ तदेवापः B. देवापः A. Ca.  
 P. 661. l. 10. (VIII. 47, 16.) द्विताय । Ca. द्विताय च । A. द्विताय च पूरणः B.  
 P. 661. l. 12. (VIII. 47, 16.) °रूपवत् C. रूतवत् Ca. सूतवत् A.  
 P. 661. l. 19. (VIII. 47, 17.) सदाय A. Ca.; deest in B. सदाय ?  
 P. 663. l. 4. (VIII. 48, 2.) अदीनः from B.  
 P. 663. l. 17. (VIII. 48, 3.) ततोऽमृता ॥ त्वतो मूमा अमृता A. Ca. त्वतः अमृता B.  
 P. 664. l. 1. (VIII. 48, 4.) अस्माभिः पतित्वं from B.  
 P. 664. l. 13. (VIII. 48, 5.) ता B. ते A. Ca.  
 P. 664. l. 24. (VIII. 48, 6.) संधुक्षणेन B. संक्षणेन A., यु marg. भक्षणेन Ca. Cf. Gitagov.  
 III. 12, where न संधुक्षते is explained by दीप्यते सुखं न भवति ।  
 P. 666. l. 4. (VIII. 48, 9.) श्रेष्ठान् A. Ca. श्रेष्ठः B.  
 P. 666. l. 14. (VIII. 48, 10.) B. reads चिरकालावस्थानं एमि इन्द्रमपि याचे ।, which is no improvement.  
 P. 666. l. 21. (VIII. 48, 11.) पीडा from B.  
 P. 666. l. 22. (VIII. 48, 11.) A. Ca. read तविषीचीः.  
 P. 666. l. 23. (VIII. 48, 11.) अभैषुः त्यजंतु B.  
 P. 666. l. 23. (VIII. 48, 11.) अपरागे C. अपरागे Ca. अपराधे A. B.  
 P. 666. l. 23. (VIII. 48, 11.) यस्मात् ॥ तस्मात् A. B. Ca.  
 P. 668. l. 13. (VIII. 48, 15.) विश्रुतो B. विश्रुताभिः A. Ca.  
 P. 689. l. 13. (VIII. 60, 1.) भक्षयतु after अनक्तु A. marg.  
 P. 692. l. 3. (VIII. 60, 8.) मर्ताय मरणधर्माय from B.  
 P. 693. l. 6. (VIII. 60, 11.) शंस्यं शंसनीयं B.  
 P. 693. l. 7. (VIII. 60, 11.) माति नो ॥ मातिनो B. मानितिनौ A. Ca.  
 P. 693. l. 16. (VIII. 60, 12.) तद्धनं ॥ तं धनं A. B. Ca. त धनं C. Mill.  
 P. 695. l. 13. (VIII. 60, 17.) B. begins हे देवाः.  
 P. 695. l. 13. (VIII. 60, 17.) हे यजमाना ॥ गेहे यजमानाः A. Ca. गेहे यजमानाः वयं B. गृहे यज-  
 मानाः C. Mill.  
 P. 695. l. 15. (VIII. 60, 17.) अधृतकर्माणां A. Ca. अधृतगमनं B. अधृतगमनकर्माणां A. marg.  
 P. 695. l. 18. (VIII. 60, 17.) प्राख्युपकारसिद्धं B. प्राख्युपकारं सिद्धं A. Ca.  
 P. 695. l. 21. (VIII. 60, 20.) यातना ॥ यानां A. Ca.  
 P. 695. l. 25. (VIII. 60, 20.) च न ॥ च A. Ca. न B.  
 P. 697. l. 23. (VIII. 61, 2.) °दुपकारकाया ॥ °दुपकारकस्य A. Ca. °दुपकारस्य क C. Mill.  
 P. 698. l. 16. (VIII. 61, 4.) भवति ॥ भवतु ?  
 P. 699. l. 10. (VIII. 61, 6.) पौरो by conjecture.  
 P. 701. l. 19. (VIII. 61, 11.) सचा सहिताः B. सचा सहासहिताः Ca. सचा सहायसहिताः A. by  
 correction.

- P. 703. l. 20. (VIII. 61, 16.) पश्चात् before पश्चात् by conjecture.
- P. 703. l. 20. (VIII. 61, 16.) भागात् etc. पश्चाद्भागो पुरः पूर्वो भागोऽथरादधोभाग A. B. Ca.
- P. 703. l. 23. (VIII. 61, 16.) तथा from the margin of A. आसुराणि ॥ आसुरीः A. B. Ca.
- P. 704. l. 9. (VIII. 61, 17.) रक्षसि ॥ क्षतास्वसि A. Ca.
- P. 704. l. 23. (VIII. 62, 1.) सम्प्रत्याद्याश्च तिस्रो A. B. Ca. The MSS. of the Anukramanī leave out the च.
- P. 705. l. 25. (VIII. 62, 3.) चिद्वर्ता ॥ चार्वाता A. B. Ca.
- P. 707. l. 2. (VIII. 62, 6.) दृष्ट्वा by conjecture. गत्वा A. B. Ca. गत्वा C. Mill. आगत्य would not be appropriate.
- P. 707. l. 4. (VIII. 62, 6.) अवेक्षितं ॥ अवेक्षितुं Ca. अवेक्षितुं A.
- P. 707. l. 12. (VIII. 62, 7.) ददुः । from B.
- P. 707. l. 15. (VIII. 62, 7.) हे पुरुषुत इन्द्र त्वं विश्वस्य पतिः भवसीति समन्वयः । B. C. Mill has °स्तुतेन्द्र भद्रा साति समन्वयः ।
- P. 709. l. 14. (VIII. 63, 1.) गायत्रे after चानुष्टुभो A. Ca.; not in C. and the Anukramanī.
- P. 710. l. 11. (VIII. 63, 3.) विद्वानुपायज्ञः ॥ विद्वानुपाय चास्मै ज्ञः A. Ca. ज्ञः wanting in C. Mill.
- P. 710. l. 12. (VIII. 63, 3.) उपवारितवान् ॥ उवारितवान् A. Ca. उपवारितवान् A. by correction. उत्सारितवान् B.
- P. 712. l. 12. (VIII. 63, 9.) लभे लभ्ये ॥ लभ्ये A. Ca.
- P. 712. l. 25. (VIII. 63, 11.) अतिशयेन स्तुमः from B.
- P. 714. l. 1. (VIII. 64, 2.) तव ॥ सतव A. Ca. प्रतिनिधि and सदृश are construed with the genitive, according to Pān. II. 3, 72.
- P. 714. l. 2. (VIII. 64, 2.) B. adds at the end अतस्त्वं महानसि ॥
- P. 714. l. 12. (VIII. 64, 4.) प्रगच्छ C. प्रागच्छ A. B. Ca.
- P. 714. l. 12. (VIII. 64, 4.) दिवि द्युलोकात् किं क्षयो निवासं A. B. दिवि द्युलोकात् । किं क्षयो निवासं Ca. दिवि द्युलोकात् - क्षयो निवासं C. Mill.
- P. 715. l. 7. (VIII. 64, 7.) विस्तीर्णकंधरः from the margin of A.
- P. 716. l. 10. (VIII. 64, 11.) Sāyana seems to have read अग्निं श्रितः for अग्निं प्रियः. B. reads अग्निं आश्रितः and afterwards यः सोमः प्रियः स एवायं etc.
- P. 719. l. 10. (VIII. 65, 10.) पृथतीनामश्चानां B.
- P. 719. l. 21. (VIII. 65, 12.) इन्द्रे प्रीत ॥ इन्द्रः प्रीत A. Ca. इन्द्रः प्रीतः B.
- P. 720. l. 5. (VIII. 66, 1.) ऽयं by conjecture.
- P. 720. l. 17. (VIII. 66, 1.) तमिन्द्रं B. त्वदर्शं A. Ca.
- P. 720. l. 25. (VIII. 66, 2.) अन्नस्य सोमस्य from B. A. Ca. mark a lacuna.
- P. 720. l. 26. (VIII. 66, 2.) य after आदृत्य by conjecture. B. puts it before दाता.
- P. 721. l. 10. (VIII. 66, 3.) किमस्य कथं ज्ञात इति च and then a lacuna in A. Ca. The च is perhaps वचनात्. Or supply इति च व्युत्पत्तिः ।
- P. 721. l. 12. (VIII. 66, 3.) बहुलस्य from B. After अपवरणीयं some other word like व्रजं seems to be necessary.
- P. 722. l. 13. (VIII. 66, 6.) द्युक्ष द्युमन् B. द्युक्षमन् A. Ca.

P. 723. l. 1. (VIII. 66, 7.) हरत ॥ हर वा A. Ca. हर B.

P. 723. l. 9. (VIII. 66, 8.) मार्गेषु प्रज्ञानेषु वा Ca. मार्गेषु B. वा A.

P. 723. l. 11. (VIII. 66, 8.) वृकोऽपि ॥ वृषि A. Ca.

P. 724. l. 1. (VIII. 66, 9.) वृत्तहस्यं ॥ वृत्तहस्ये A. Ca.

P. 724. l. 9. (VIII. 66, 10.) न कदाचित् and then a lacuna marked in A. Ca. व्यहं-  
भवदि etc. व्ययं हं अभवदि° C. Mill and C. Wilson. This lacuna can be supplied in the  
following manner: न कदाचिदित्यभिप्रायः । सर्वं हंतव्यं हतमभवदित्यर्थः ।

P. 724. l. 14. (VIII. 66, 10.) A. Ca. mark a lacuna after दातव्य. The context may  
have been दातव्याविति वापुषिकनयेन etc. Durya on the Nirukta gives no particular  
explanation.

P. 724. l. 14. (VIII. 66, 10.) तानहर्दृशः B. ते वाहर्दृशः A. Ca.

P. 724. l. 15. (VIII. 66, 10.) पश्यन्ति ॥ पश्यति A. B. Ca.

P. 724. l. 16. (VIII. 66, 10.) पश्यन्ति ॥ पश्यति A. Ca.

P. 724. l. 18. (VIII. 66, 10.) A. Ca. mark a lacuna after अतो. B. omits अतो and  
has ईदृशान् पणीन् etc.

P. 725. l. 6. (VIII. 66, 11.) °तात्पर्याद्वृत्ति° ॥ °तात्पर्याद्वृत्ति° A. Ca. तात्पर्यात् B.

P. 726. l. 6. (VIII. 66, 14.) अमतेदारिद्र्यात्मिकायाः B. अ - मतेदारिद्र्यात्मिका A. Ca.

P. 726. l. 21. (VIII. 67, 1.) आदित्यान् ॥ आदित्यं A. B. Ca.

P. 726. l. 22. (VIII. 67, 1.) आदित्या ॥ आदित्यो A. B. Ca.

P. 729. l. 2. (VIII. 67, 9.) मर्चयता ॥ मर्चयन्ता A. Ca. सुपेशसे° A. Ca.

P. 729. l. 4. (VIII. 67, 9.) प्राप्ता etc. ॥ प्राप्तां बाधामा नोऽस्माकं etc. A. Ca.

P. 730. l. 1. (VIII. 67, 12.) दूरमियमदितिः ॥ दूरयमदितिः A. Ca. भूररूपा A. Ca. भूमिरूपा?

P. 730. l. 2. (VIII. 67, 12.) After उरुचि something seems left out, unless we change  
उरुत्वं into उर्वि त्वं.

P. 730. l. 4. (VIII. 67, 12.) जीवेनापृत्यान्निहन्तुं A. Ca. unintelligible.

P. 730. l. 8. (VIII. 67, 13.) उच्छ्रयन्तः ॥ उच्छ्रयन्ता A. Ca.

P. 730. l. 14. (VIII. 67, 14.) A. Ca. have क्राणान् before वृकाणां. B. क्राणान्. This is  
either a repetition of वृकाणां or one has to read नोऽस्माकं प्राणान्.

P. 731. l. 19. (VIII. 67, 18.) A. Ca., not B., have after मुंचतु again सुत्वं भवत्वित्यर्थः ।  
B. adds दृष्टान्तः बंधात् बद्धमिव बद्धं पुरुषं बंधात् यथा विमुंचति तद्वत् ॥

P. 732. l. 1. (VIII. 67, 19.) मृळत सुखयत B.

P. 732. l. 6. (VIII. 67, 20.) पुत्रे पितृशब्दः ॥ पुत्रे पि त्व शब्दः A. Ca. ; not in B.

P. 733. l. 8. (VIII. 68, 1.) अंततः ॥ अथ ततः A. Ca.

P. 734. l. 8. (VIII. 68, 3.) तवेत्यर्थः C. भ इत्यर्थः A. Ca.

P. 735. l. 15. (VIII. 68, 5.) योगत्वादित्त्वा° ॥ योगस्त्वदित्त्वा° A. Ca., very doubtful.

P. 736. l. 8. (VIII. 68, 8.) बलवत्त्रिंशत् यस्य B. बल --- नि यस्य A. Ca.

P. 736. l. 14. (VIII. 68, 9.) कर्तुं after स्नानादिव्यवहारं by conjecture. कुर्वन् A. B. Ca.

P. 736. l. 17. (VIII. 68, 10.) प्रतिपत् to सुतमंभ इति inserted in accordance with Áśval.  
and Sāyana to VIII. 2, 1. तं त्वा यज्ञेभिरिति तृचो मरुत्वतीपनुचभाविनि A. Ca.

- P. 737. l. 1. (VIII. 68, 10.) ररक्षिष ॥ ररक्ष्य A. B. Ca.  
 P. 737. l. 10. (VIII. 68, 11.) तननीयः ॥ तंतनीयः A. B. Ca. : cf. VI. 18, 6.  
 P. 737. l. 15. (VIII. 68, 12.) तथा तने by conjecture.  
 P. 738. l. 6. (VIII. 68, 14.) पितृपुत्र° ॥ पितृपितृ° A. B. Ca.  
 P. 738. l. 11. (VIII. 68, 15.) आतिथिग्व ॥ अतिथिग्वे A. Ca. : cf. VIII. 57, 16, 17.  
 P. 738. l. 13. (VIII. 68, 15.) इंद्रोत ॥ इंद्र A. Ca.  
 P. 738. l. 19. (VIII. 68, 15.) एवमृक्षाश्च° ॥ एवं तपृक्षाश्च° A. Ca.  
 P. 739. l. 6. (VIII. 68, 17.) °वचन इंद्रोतदानस्य ॥ वचन इंद्रोतदानस्य A. Ca.  
 P. 739. l. 17. (VIII. 68, 19.) निनित्सुश्चन to युष्मासु from C. युष्मे युष्मासु मर्त्यः मनुष्यः अथवां  
 निनित्सुः नेतुमिच्छुः नादीधरत् च नैवोपपद्यते खलु अतो etc. B.  
 P. 740. l. 11. (VIII. 69, 1.) उननीति ॥ ऊंदिति A. ऊंदितोति Ca.  
 P. 740. l. 22. (VIII. 69, 2.) हि to सर्वत from C. The passage occurs in the Sāma-  
 veda II. 862.  
 P. 741. l. 14. (VIII. 69, 2.) दिवीति शेषः ॥ दिवीत्यः A. Ca. शेषः C. Mill.  
 P. 741. l. 14. (VIII. 69, 2.) आदित्यस्य C. आदित्य A. Ca.  
 P. 741. l. 15. (VIII. 69, 2.) आरोचमाने ॥ आरोचने A. Ca.  
 P. 741. l. 17. (VIII. 69, 4.) A. C. Ca. mark a lacuna after ऽनुरूपः, extending to the  
 beginning of the verse. This has been supplied in accordance with Rig-veda  
 VIII. 45, 1.  
 P. 741. l. 24. (VIII. 69, 4.) तत्तानुरक्तत्वात् ॥ तत्तानुरक्तत्वात् Ca. तथानुरक्तत्वात् A. °कृत्वात् C. Mill.  
 P. 742. l. 14. (VIII. 69, 7.) मित्येषा to यद्यदा from C. वधस्य विष्टपं सूर्यस्य from B.  
 P. 743. l. 9. (VIII. 69, 8.) तद्भोत्वा C. तज्जेत्वा A. B. Ca.  
 P. 744. l. 7. (VIII. 69, 10.) आपतंति etc. ॥ सापतितं वृष्टिरत्याययदा etc. A. Ca.  
 P. 744. l. 26. (VIII. 69, 12.) सूर्यं सुषिरामिव is not explained in A. C. Ca. यथा सूर्यं प्रति  
 रश्मिजालं तद्वत् B. The verse occurs in Yāska V. 27, and is explained in Rig-veda,  
 vol. I. p. 38.  
 P. 746. l. 12. (VIII. 69, 16.) °नंतरं to °नंतरं from Ca.  
 P. 746. l. 14. (VIII. 69, 16.) पुनः कीदृशं from B. तकिं A. Ca.  
 P. 746. l. 14. (VIII. 69, 16.) कीदृशं after रचं A. Ca.  
 P. 746. l. 24. (VIII. 69, 17.) खराजं twice, A. Ca., not C.  
 P. 747. l. 20. (VIII. 70, 1.) यो राजा etc. supplied from the Ait. Ār. A. C. Ca. mark  
 a lacuna.  
 P. 748. l. 2. (VIII. 70, 1.) सेनानां C. Mill. सर्वेषां संश्रामाणां B. ; deest in A. Ca.  
 P. 748. l. 23. (VIII. 70, 3.) After अनुकूलं some word like करोति is wanted.  
 P. 749. l. 20. (VIII. 70, 5.) मूर्ध्वप्रतिविंबाय ॥ मूर्ध्वप्रतिविंबाय A. Ca. गूर्तिप्रतिविंबाय C. विंबाय B.  
 P. 749. l. 22. (VIII. 70, 5.) किंचन ॥ किंचमनु A. Ca.  
 P. 750. l. 6. (VIII. 70, 6.) B. begins हे श्विष्ट बलवन् मधवन् धनवन्.  
 P. 750. l. 6. (VIII. 70, 6.) वृषा before आपप्राय A. Ca.  
 P. 750. l. 17. (VIII. 70, 7.) मनुष्यः from C.

P. 750. l. 18. (VIII. 70, 7.) यो मर्त्यो ॥ स मर्त्यो यस्येन्द्रस्य २° A. Ca. स मर्त्यः अस्येन्द्रस्य २° B. B. begins with यः सदेवः etc.

P. 750. l. 19. (VIII. 70, 7.) योजयति A. Ca. योजयति B.

P. 750. l. 19. (VIII. 70, 7.) After गंतुं there seems to have been a lacuna, which in C. Mill is left unsupplied. The commentary given in A. B. and Ca. is clearly spurious.

P. 751. l. 11. (VIII. 70, 9.) उत्पापय ॥ उत्पापयत A. B. Ca.

P. 751. l. 20. (VIII. 70, 10.) प्रभूतधन B. प्रभूतमिवा A. Ca. \*

P. 752. l. 8. (VIII. 70, 11.) सखा B. सखायः A. Ca.

P. 753. l. 20. (VIII. 70, 15.) हितं शौरदेवं ॥ हितः शौरदेव A. B. Ca. हितः शौरदेव B. by correction.

P. 753. l. 21. (VIII. 70, 15.) Sāyana read *ná* instead of *naḥ*.

P. 754. l. 8. (VIII. 70, 15.) कस्य महोभिः A. B. Ca.

P. 754. l. 9. (VIII. 70, 15.) विधस्या by conjecture. विधाद्° A. B. Ca.

P. 754. l. 9. (VIII. 70, 15.) तत्सकाशात् by conjecture. सकाशात् A. Ca. B.

P. 754. l. 11. (VIII. 71, 1.) अथवा to संबंधनीयं A. Ca.; not in C. Mill nor in B.

P. 754. l. 18. (VIII. 71, 1.) अस्मदादिभिः ॥ अस्मादिभिः A. Ca.

P. 754. l. 25. (VIII. 71, 3.) The commentator must have read in the text, स नो वस्त्र उप मास्यूजो नपात् etc.: cf. VIII. 60, 9. त्वं नोऽस्मभ्यं विश्वेभिर्देवेभिर्धनं प्रयच्छसि । हे ऊजो etc. Could विश्वेभिर्देवेभिः have been inserted in order to remove the punarukti pointed out and explained away by Sāyana?

P. 755. l. 7. (VIII. 71, 4.) यं ॥ यदा A. Ca. यदा यं B.

P. 756. l. 14. (VIII. 71, 9.) °नपात्त्वं ॥ नपादित्वं A. Ca., which stands perhaps for नपादादित्वं.

P. 757. l. 2. (VIII. 71, 10.) वाग्निं after °ज्वालं A. Ca.

P. 757. l. 26. (VIII. 71, 12.) धीषु सुबुद्धिषु B. before प्रथमं.

P. 758. l. 9. (VIII. 71, 13.) अथवा ॥ अतिवा A. Ca.

P. 759. l. 4. (VIII. 71, 15.) भयानामभिघ्नं ॥ भयानंममश्रवणं A. Ca.

P. 760. l. 6. (VIII. 72, 3.) अंतः आयतनमध्ये before इच्छंति B.

P. 760. l. 6. (VIII. 72, 3.) स्वपंतं ॥ स्वपनं A. स्वयनं C. स्वयनं B.

P. 760. l. 8. (VIII. 72, 3.) मध्यमं ॥ Roth's edition माध्यमिकं.

P. 760. l. 24. (VIII. 72, 5.) ऽयं रुशंश्चरंश्चे° ॥ यं चरंश्चे° Ca. हंश्चरंश्चे° A.

P. 761. l. 5. (VIII. 72, 6.) स्पूलं ॥ स्पलं A. B. Ca.

P. 761. l. 6. (VIII. 72, 6.) रषेऽश्चान् etc. ॥ रषेऽश्चान्प्रास्जनिंयोजयतेति सेतयर्थः । A. Ca.

P. 761. l. 13. (VIII. 72, 7.) प्रतिप्रस्थातायै C. प्रस्थ° A. Ca.; deest in B.

P. 762. l. 13. (VIII. 72, 10.) परिणत्याभं B. परिणेत्याभं A. Ca. परिगंतारं?

P. 762. l. 14. (VIII. 72, 10.) नीचीनद्वारं ॥ नीचीनवारं मृतवारं (i. e. न्यमृतद्वारं) B. नीचीनवारं नीचीनद्वारं C.

P. 762. l. 21. (VIII. 72, 11.) वपुष्करे, cf. Nir. V. 14.

P. 762. l. 22. (VIII. 72, 11.) आसंध्यं A. Ca. आसद्यां B.

P. 763. l. 2. (VIII. 72, 12.) अरिप्सोः A. C. आरिप्सोः Ca.

- P. 763. l. 4. (VIII. 72, 12.) गवाजयोः ॥ गवाञ्चयोः C. गवा - योः A. Ca.
- P. 764. l. 4. (VIII. 72, 15.) धारकमाजं ॥ धारकमौग्रं A. Ca. धारकं B. धारकग्नं C. Mill.
- P. 764. l. 19. (VIII. 72, 16.) मधुधुक्तं ॥ मधुक्क A. Ca.
- P. 764. l. 24. (VIII. 72, 17.) तत्र हेतुमाह ॥ तत्र हेतुं A. Ca. तत्र हेतुं B. C.
- P. 765. l. 5. (VIII. 72, 18.) पवमाने ॥ एवमाने A. Ca. एवं माने B.
- P. 765. l. 7. (VIII. 72, 18.) नु शीघ्रं B. at the end of the commentary.
- P. 766. l. 23. (VIII. 73, 6.) The commentary on ver. 6. is omitted in A. Ca. It is printed from C. Mill. B. has हे अश्निना °नौ यामहूतमा यज्ञे मुखतमौ नेदिहमंतिकतममायं प्राप्नव्यं यामि। प्राप्नोमि। जंति°. It seems an old lacuna, supplied independently by C. Mill and B.
- P. 768. l. 4. (VIII. 73, 11.) अर्थमागमनाय ॥ अर्थगमनाय A. B. Ca.
- P. 768. l. 12. (VIII. 73, 12.) बंधकः सुवः ॥ बंधकसुवः Ca. बंधकस्तुचः A. बंधुकः स्तुतः B. Cf. Kuhn's Zeitschrift, I. p. 442.
- P. 768. l. 13. (VIII. 73, 12.) अथवर्षिहं ॥ अथ वा यु हं A. अथ वायुरहं Ca. आद्या वा युरहं C. Mill. (जरायु?); deest in B.
- P. 769. l. 4. (VIII. 73, 15.) समूहैः by conjecture. अश्न A. B. Ca.
- P. 769. l. 16. (VIII. 73, 17.) निवारयति B. निशरयति A. Ca.
- P. 769. l. 22. (VIII. 73, 18.) आकर्षया or कर्षया A. B. Ca. instead of आकर्षकया.
- P. 770. l. 9. (VIII. 74, 1.) व्योम° ॥ त्वाव्योम° A. Ca.
- P. 770. l. 18. (VIII. 74, 1.) नु deest in B.
- P. 771. l. 20. (VIII. 74, 5.) जाततेजसाद्यु° ॥ जाततेजोद्यु° A. Ca. जातधनं B.
- P. 772. l. 24. (VIII. 74, 9.) संबंधीति ॥ संबंधिनमिति A. B. Ca.
- P. 773. l. 9. (VIII. 74, 10.) प्राप्नुप after तूर्वप B.
- P. 774. l. 8. (VIII. 74, 13.) Sāyana seems to have read वृक्षा for मृक्षा. B. has मृक्षा मक्षायि केशवंति.
- P. 774. l. 9. (VIII. 74, 13.) ब्रश्चते C. ब्रश्चत A. Ca.
- P. 778. l. 21. (VIII. 75, 13.) अन्यमस्तोतारं ॥ अन्यस्तोतारं A. Ca. अन्यं स्तोतारं B.
- P. 781. l. 22. (VIII. 76, 8.) हृदा मनसा भक्त्या from B.
- P. 782. l. 2. (VIII. 76, 9.) अहाम° ॥ अहाम° A. Ca.
- P. 782. l. 3. (VIII. 76, 9.) शतून् from B. Ca.
- P. 782. l. 23. (VIII. 76, 11.) साष्टपदी ॥ साष्टपदी A. Ca. प्राप्ता B.
- P. 782. l. 25. (VIII. 76, 11.) मया A. Ca. अहं B.
- P. 783. l. 22. (VIII. 77, 3.) रज्ज्वेव । तया ॥ स्त्रेवलया A. चलया B. रज्ज्वे ल या C. Mill. रज्जुः is feminine, though Wilson gives it as a masculine.
- P. 785. l. 13. (VIII. 77, 9.) नतानि ॥ नित्त A. Ca. नीतानि B.
- P. 785. l. 13. (VIII. 77, 9.) चौत्तानि अत्युत्कृष्टानि तव बलानि भूमेः किल etc. B.
- P. 785. l. 13. (VIII. 77, 9.) भूमेः किल बद्धाधारणानि ॥ भूमे किल बद्धाधारणया A. भूमे कीलवद्धाधारणया Ca. भूमेः किल बद्धाधारण B. कीलवद्धाधारणानि? Cf. Notes to VII. 99, 3.
- P. 786. l. 4. (VIII. 77, 10.) किंचिद्भो ॥ -- नवानपीद्भो A. Ca. किंच इंद्रः B.
- P. 786. l. 23. (VIII. 77, 10.) चरमपादिनोच्यते ॥ चारमपादिनोच्यते Ca. वा° A.



P. 787. l. 3. (VIII. 77, 11.) यास्केन etc. ॥ व्याख्यातवान्नेव लिख्यते । यास्कः । A. Ca.

P. 787. l. 6. (VIII. 77, 11.) गमनयातिनौ शब्दपातिनौ दूरपातिनौ and afterwards गमनवेधिनौ शब्दवेधिनौ दूरवेधिनौ Roth's edition. B. begins हे इंद्र ते तव धनुस्तुविषं etc. It explains सुसंस्कृतौ by सुष्ठु अलंकृतौ ।

P. 787. l. 16. (VIII. 78, 1.) B. explains अंधः by सोमं.

P. 789. l. 2. (VIII. 78, 6.) यदा तं निंदितुमिच्छति । The MSS. have यदा त्वं निंदितुमिच्छसि, a construction which, though intelligible, is unusual in Sanskrit, particularly as the next sentence is carried on in the third person.

P. 789. l. 14. (VIII. 78, 8.) यद्वेद्रः सोमं पीत्वा सोम इत्यभिहितः । The MSS. have यद्वेद्रः पीतं सोमो or सोमी बिहितः ।

P. 789. l. 21. (VIII. 78, 9.) प्राप्तेच्छं ॥ आप्तेच्छं A. Ca.

P. 790. l. 3. (VIII. 78, 10.) निष्कृतस्य ॥ निष्कृतस्य A. Ca.

P. 790. l. 24. (VIII. 79, 2.) पंगुरपि from B. A. Ca. mark a lacuna after ओणोऽपि.

P. 791. l. 5. (VIII. 79, 3.) कृत्येभ्य इत्यर्थः । Kṛitya is here used in the sense of "traitor, enemy." See Wilson, s. v., and B. R. s. v. I. b.

P. 792. l. 2. (VIII. 79, 6.) A. Ca. have no commentary to the 3rd pāda. तदा ईं अतीर्णं एतं यज्ञारंभिणं आयुः जीवनं प्र तारीत् प्रकर्षेण वर्धयेत् ॥ B.

P. 792. l. 6. (VIII. 79, 7.) हे सोम पीतस्त्वं नोऽस्माकं कृत् हृदये पीताय हृदय संभव । अपरो नः पुराणः A. Ca. हे सोम पीतस्त्वं नोऽस्माकं कृत् हृदये वर्तमानः सुशेव अपरो नः पुराणः C. Mill. हे सोम पीतः त्वं नः अस्माकं हृदे हृदये पीताय शं सुखं भव किंच नः अस्माकं सुशेवः सुमुखः मृळयाकुः सुखकर्ता अदृमक्तुः आसमाप्रकर्षी पुनः पुनः यागप्रवर्तकः अवातः निश्चलश्च भवेति अन्वयः । B.

P. 792. l. 21. (VIII. 79, 9.) त्वं च ईक्षसे C. Mill. त्वं च ईक्षसे B. त्वं - ईक्षसे A. Ca.

P. 793. l. 9. (VIII. 80, 1.) A. Ca. mark a lacuna after बर्. बला बहुकृत्य B.

P. 793. l. 14. (VIII. 80, 2.) The commentary to this verse is given from B. A. Ca. mark a lacuna.

P. 794. l. 9. (VIII. 80, 5.) वाजयु ॥ One Pada MS. (Taylor) has वाजयुः, and in the commentary B. reads वाजयुः and इच्छन् instead of इच्छत्. This seems preferable, as far as the sense is concerned.

P. 794. l. 22. (VIII. 80, 7.) पूरयसि A. Ca.; deest in B. It may be meant for पुरायसि, as a denominative verb derived from पुरे.

P. 795. l. 8. (VIII. 80, 8.) स्थिता A. Ca.

P. 795. l. 16. (VIII. 80, 9.) सोमनि before सोमयाज्ञी A. Ca., not C. सोमनि B.

P. 796. l. 14. (VIII. 81, 1.) त्वं तु from B.

P. 796. l. 14. (VIII. 81, 1.) नोऽस्मभ्यं A. B. Ca.

P. 797. l. 1. (VIII. 81, 3.) वृषभं ॥ वृषभं A. Ca. before वृषभं.

P. 797. l. 11. (VIII. 81, 4.) स्वर्गे राजमानं from C.

P. 797. l. 17. (VIII. 81, 6.) उपमानं ॥ उपमानं A. Ca. B.

P. 797. l. 18. (VIII. 81, 6.) स्त्रीकविंति A. Ca. after अभिगृणातु.

P. 798. l. 16. (VIII. 81, 9.) तव वाजा ॥ तव वाजाः अश्याः B. तव आ A. Ca.

- P. 801. l. 2. (VIII. 82, 5.) सोऽस्मानिः ॥ सह अस्मानिः A. B. Ca.  
 P. 802. l. 12. (VIII. 82, 9.) त्वं पिब ॥ ता पिब A. Ca.  
 P. 803. l. 5. (VIII. 83, 2.) अहःसु after सर्वेषु by conjecture.  
 P. 803. l. 13. (VIII. 83, 3.) A lacuna marked after संबंधि in A. C. Ca. त्वाकर्ताक्षप्यते C. त्वा कर्ताक्षप्यते A. त्वा कर्ताक्षप्यते Ca.  
 P. 803. l. 14. (VIII. 83, 3.) A. C. Ca. mark a lacuna after विष्पिता, which has been supplied by विष्पितानि. Nothing else seems omitted. Cf. Nir. VI. 20. and Rv. VII. 60, 7.  
 P. 803. l. 16. (VIII. 83, 3.) नोऽस्मानतिपर्वष from B.  
 P. 805. l. 11. (VIII. 83, 9.) द्रुवे by conjecture. B. puts it behind अयि च ।.  
 P. 805. l. 24. (VIII. 84, 1.) रयी रयेन B. रय्येधक A. Ca.  
 P. 805. l. 26. (VIII. 84, 1.) काव्य ॥ क A. Ca. कः B.  
 P. 806. l. 13. (VIII. 84, 3.) °तमाग्ने ॥ तमेन्द्र A. B. Ca.; also the commentary to Sv. II. 5, 1, 18.  
 P. 806. l. 14. (VIII. 84, 3.) नृप्य इति ॥ तत्प्रति A. Ca.; deest in B. Cf. Rv. Bh. I. 121, 1.  
 P. 806. l. 18. (VIII. 84, 3.) रक्ष त्वद° रजनद° A. C. Ca. रक्ष च दन्यं comm. to Sv. II. 5, 1, 18.  
 P. 807. l. 11. (VIII. 84, 5.) वस्तुभ्यं A. Ca. Instead of वच्यादेशस्य, the comm. to Sv. II. 7, 2, 6, reads वृ आदेशस्य.  
 P. 807. l. 20. (VIII. 84, 6.) सुतीः to कल्याण° from Ca.  
 P. 808. l. 18. (VIII. 84, 9.) साधयद्भिः ॥ साधयोभिः A. Ca.  
 P. 810. l. 21. (VIII. 85, 7.) दृढाङ्गोपेते B. दृढाङ्गोपेते A. Ca.  
 P. 811. l. 12. (VIII. 85, 9.) सोमस्य by conjecture.  
 P. 812. l. 1. (VIII. 86, 1.) भीतिमपनयतः ॥ भीतिं समनयतः A. Ca.  
 P. 812. l. 4. (VIII. 86, 1.) अस्ताविषायां ॥ अस्ताविषाद्या A. Ca. अस्ताविषा C. Mill. अस्ताविषायाः B.  
 P. 812. l. 6. (VIII. 86, 1.) निमिहं ॥ सनिमिहं A. Ca. निमिहं B.  
 P. 812. l. 7. (VIII. 86, 1.) मा to स्थित्वा from Ca.  
 P. 812. l. 19. (VIII. 86, 2.) धनं । तस्या° etc. ॥ धनवतमभिलषि° A. Ca. धनमभिलषि° B.  
 P. 814. l. 21. (VIII. 87, 1.) स्तोमः स्तोता भवति ॥ स्तोमस्ताभवसि A. C. Ca.  
 P. 814. l. 26. (VIII. 87, 1.) देवते before ऽस्मिन् A. Ca.  
 P. 815. l. 8. (VIII. 87, 2.) A. Ca. omit the commentary from पातं सुवं to the beginning of the fifth verse. This omission has been supplied from C.  
 P. 818. l. 3. (VIII. 88, 1.) वसोः पात्रे निवसतः ॥ वसे प्रातः प्रतिनिवसतः A. Ca.  
 P. 821. l. 14. (VIII. 89, 1.) A. C. Ca. mark a lacuna after देवनशीलं.  
 P. 822. l. 24. (VIII. 89, 4.) गच्छंतु ॥ गच्छंति B. गच्छति A. Ca.  
 P. 824. l. 6. (VIII. 89, 7.) सुत्वा ॥ The construction is faulty. सुत्वा might be changed into सुतवन्तः, but the mistake was evidently committed by the author himself, and not by the copyists.  
 P. 824. l. 16. (VIII. 90, 1.) समसंख्याकाः सतोबृहयः from C.  
 P. 825. l. 1. (VIII. 90, 1.) वा before अलं° by conjecture.

P. 825. l. 16. (VIII. 90, 2.) तत्पुत्रस्य ॥ न पुत्रस्य A. Ca.

P. 825. l. 25. (VIII. 90, 3.) सम्यग्यो° ॥ Ca. सस्य यो° A. सप्तस्य यो° B.

P. 826. l. 7. (VIII. 90, 4.) तानि प्रह्नीभावयसि ॥ नानि प्रह्नीभवसि A. Ca.

P. 826. l. 14. (VIII. 91, 1.) As the text and commentary of this hymn have been published by Professor Aufrecht in the "Indische Studien," I find it necessary to justify the readings adopted in my edition, and to state more fully the reasons for which I either agree with or differ from him.

P. 827. l. 19. (VIII. 91, 1.) चिरकालं. Is it चिरकालं or चिरं कालं? The reading in A. is doubtful. There is a mark over the र which may be intended for Anusvāra. Ca., however, has no Anusvāra. In C. Mill, C. Wilson, and B. the passage is omitted. As the authority of the MSS. is not decisive, we must consult other passages in which Sāyaṇa uses the same word. Thus, Rv. I. 125, 1, A. Ca. B. all have चिरकालं, not चिरं कालं. I therefore adopted चिरकालं.

P. 827. l. 21. (VIII. 91, 1.) प्रत्यगमत्. A. and Ca. have प्रत्यगमयत्; Prof. Aufrecht rightly preferred the reading of C. Mill and C. Wilson, प्रत्यगमत्.

P. 827. l. 22. (VIII. 91, 1.) दंतघर्षण. I adopt the reading of C. Mill and C. Wilson, घर्षण, instead of the reading of A. and Ca. घर्षे, preferred by Prof. Aufrecht. Though both are right, घर्षण expresses the act of grinding more definitely than घर्षे.

P. 827. l. 24. (VIII. 91, 1.) अन्नं कन्या. This is the reading of all the MSS., and I see no necessity for adopting the conjecture of Prof. Aufrecht, अन्निकन्या, in the sense of अन्निसुता.

P. 828. l. 1. (VIII. 91, 1.) After करिष्यामि it is absolutely necessary to insert इति, though A. and Ca. omit it. In C. Mill the whole passage is omitted.

P. 828. l. 8. (VIII. 91, 1.) The singular युक्तं after the plural स्तानि is certainly wrong. A., Ca., C. Mill, and C. Wilson, however, agree in युक्तं, and as the mistake may be an error of Sāyaṇa's, I abstained from changing it into युक्तानि.

P. 828. l. 8. (VIII. 91, 1.) खलति. Though खलति is given in the Dictionaries as an adjective only, there is very little, if any, doubt that Sāyaṇa used it here as a substantive. It would be easy to change खलति into खलित्वं, a reading adopted by Prof. Aufrecht. But the MSS. are against this alteration, not only here, but again p. 830. l. 24. In our passage Ca., C. Mill, and C. Wilson have खलति; A. has a lacuna. In the commentary to verse 6, however, A., Ca., C. Mill, and the B. MSS. also, all agree in the reading खलति; तच्चापगमय, which follows, must be referred to शिरः. That खलति should be used by Sāyaṇa as an adjective also, is no valid objection, particularly as the passage where it is so used, is not his own composition, but an extract from a Brāhmaṇa.

P. 828. l. 10. (VIII. 91, 1.) तस्याः पूर्वोपहता या त्वक्. A., Ca., C. Mill have तस्याः पूर्वोभिहतायाः त्वक्. The reading of the MSS. might be explained in the sense of "the

former skin of her who was thus being struck," but the construction would not be in harmony with the general style of Sáyana. Prof. Aufrecht proposed तस्याः पूर्वभिहता या त्वक्, but the right reading is supplied by the Bṛihaddevatá from which this passage is borrowed, and not unfrequently *totidem verbis*. MS. B. has,

तस्यास्त्वगपहता या पूर्वा सा शल्यकोऽभवत् ।  
उत्तरा त्वभवद्भोधा कृकलासस्त्वगुत्तमा ॥

MS. H. has,

तस्यां त्वचि व्यपेताया सर्वस्यां शल्यकोऽभवत् ।  
उत्तरा त्वभवद्भोधा कृकलासस्त्वगुत्तमा ॥

The readings thus supplied by the Bṛihaddevatá are of interest, because they show that according to the legend the cure of Apálá was effected by three skins being torn off her body. This is a new feature which to a certain extent weakens the similarity between this legend and some others of German origin, pointed out by Prof. Kuhn (*Indische Studien* I. 118).

P. 828. l. 11. (VIII. 91, 1.) The MSS. (A., Ca., C. Mill) have कृकलासो instead of कृकलासो, which is supported by the Bṛihaddevatá.

P. 828. l. 19. (VIII. 91, 1.) सुतौ । A. has स्तुति, Ca. सुती, C. Mill and C. Wils. स्तुतौ. B. (Taylor) has स्त्री सुतौ सोममार्गे, B. (Stevenson) स्त्री सुतौ मार्गे.

P. 828. l. 20. (VIII. 91, 1.) After विदुः लाभे A. Ca. have अविहृपं, C. Mill अविहृपं, without a line at the end. Prof. Aufrecht has printed अति रूपं, which would be appropriate if Sáyana, during the whole of his commentary, ever used this expression, "this is the form after the augment." I have printed लङ्घि रूपं, according to Sáyana's usual style of interpretation, but I am by no means certain that this is the right reading. It may not be at all intended as a grammatical explanation, but as an adjective to सोमं. अविहृपं तं सोमं might be intended for Soma that has not been prepared for sacrifice, Soma in its original form, such as Apálá found on the road and took home with her. Or there may be some other technical term hidden in अविहृपं, such as अविपुतं, "strained in sieves made of sheep-wool." Cf. Rv. IX. 107, 2. नूनं पुनानः अविऽभिः परि स्रव. Rv. IX. 91, 2. मृजानः अविऽभिः गोभिः अत्ऽभिः, etc. The reading remains doubtful.

P. 828. l. 23. (VIII. 91, 1.) दंतध्वनिं । A. has दंते वाज, Ca. and C. Mill दंते वाजं धनं, B. दंतध्वनिं. Prof. Aufrecht has conjectured दंतराजिध्वनिं as the original reading which led to the corruptions in A., Ca., and C. Mill. This conjecture is extremely plausible, and I should prefer it, unless the simpler reading which I adopted were supported by the B. MSS.

P. 828. l. 24. (VIII. 91, 1.) The quotations from the Sátyáyani-Bráhmaṇa can hardly ever be completely restored from the MSS. of Sáyana. There is no MS. of this Bráhmaṇa in any of the libraries of Europe, and though it is a Bráhmaṇa

belonging to the Sāma-veda, it differs so considerably from the text of those of the Sāma-veda Brāhmaṇas which are known to us from MSS., that nothing can be gained by their collation. The story of Apālā is not to be found in any of the Sāma-veda Brāhmaṇas, though I examined them all most carefully. Now the language of the Brāhmaṇas is so peculiar and so different from the common style of Sāyaṇa, that wherever we find an opportunity of comparing the original texts with the extracts given by him, we discover a more than usual number of blunders and omissions in all our MSS., and we see that, without the help of the originals, it would have been impossible to set them right. With regard to all such extracts from Brāhmaṇas in my edition of Sāyaṇa, I must crave considerable indulgence. They are given as well as they could be given with the means at my disposal; but they cannot be completely restored to correctness until we are able to procure the exact śākhās of each Brāhmaṇa from which they were copied or quoted by Sāyaṇa.

P. 828. l. 24. (VIII. 91, 1.) सोमांशुमविंदत् । A., Ca., C. Mill have सोमं सुमविंदत्; the B. MSS. never give these Brāhmaṇa passages. Prof. Aufrecht's conjecture सोमांशुं is better than सोमं सुतमविंदत्.

P. 828. l. 25. (VIII. 91, 1.) सा तमभिव्याजहार । A. Ca. have सभिव्याजहार. An accusative is wanted with सभिव्याजहार, and its former presence is indicated by the readings of C. Mill and C. Wils. सा मभिव्याजहार ।

P. 828. l. 26. (VIII. 91, 1.) अस्यै त इदं । By no means certain; A. Ca. अस्यै ता इदं, C. Mill and C. Wils. अस्यै ता इदं. इदं might be intended for इह.

P. 829. l. 18. (VIII. 91, 1.) इच्छाम एव । All the MSS., A., Ca., C. Mill, and the two B.'s, have एव after इच्छाम, and at the end of the sentence, nor does there seem to be any necessity for changing, as Prof. Aufrecht does, एव into एवं, and making it the first word of a new sentence. एव answers to चन, which is here used in a restrictive or determinative sense. It is more difficult to determine whether the next sentence, which contains another paraphrase of आचिकित्सामः, is correct as it stands in the MSS. If the text says, "we wish to know thee," this can hardly be paraphrased by "we do know thee." Rather it ought to be "we do not know thee." The same fact, namely, that Apālā for a moment did not know whether the person who had first been attracted by the noise of her chewing the Soma, and who afterwards turned away from her, was Indra or not, is mentioned also in the Itihāsa, p. 828. l. 1. Apālā asks Indra there why he does not drink the Soma from her mouth, as he goes from house to house in search of the beverage; and when she finds herself not minded by him, she says again to Indra: "I know not whether thou who art come hither art Indra, but as thou art come to our house, I will do thee honour." After having said this, however, she sees clearly that her guest is Indra and no other, and when Indra embraces her, she

makes him drink the Soma from her mouth. The first idea of this hesitation in the mind of Apálá was probably suggested to the framers of the Itihása by this very verse, "We wish indeed to know thee, we do not understand thee," and in that case, it is absolutely necessary, though without the sanction of any of the MSS., to insert the negative particle न.

P. 829. l. 22. (VIII. 91, 3.) कुत्सितं १. The reading of A., Ca., C. Mill is कुत्सितः; it is intended, however, as an adverb qualifying *śanaiḥ*, and ought to be in the neuter.

P. 829. l. 26. (VIII. 91, 3.) अथासीत्. A. Ca. have मुखादेवौघासीत् १, C. Mill and C. Wils. मुखादेवौघ्यसीत्. Prof. Aufrecht has अथासीत्, which most likely is a misprint, considering the rule of Pāp. II. 4, 37.

P. 830. l. 11. (VIII. 91, 4.) The commentary to कुविन्नो वत्ससंस्कार्त् is preserved in C. Mill and C. Wils. The omission in A. and Ca. arose from the scribe mistaking the two करोतु at the end of each sentence. B. has किंच वत्ससः प्रशस्ताः कर्त् करोतु.

P. 830. l. 11. (VIII. 91, 4.) It would be better to leave out बहु after कुवित्, because बहुवारं follows; but A., Ca., C. Mill, and B. have it.

P. 830. l. 14. (VIII. 91, 4.) अत एव यतीः १. A., Ca., C. Mill have अत यतीः, B. अच यतीः. Prof. Aufrecht conjectures, in the spirit of Sáyana, अत एव यतीः, which I have adopted, although it is difficult to understand how the mistake arose in A. and in B. With reference to the first verse one might conjecture अचयतीः, but this would not be in the usual style of Sáyana.

P. 831. l. 4. (VIII. 91, 5.) नादुस्तानि १. A., Ca., C. Mill have वसुस्थान्यु ह; the emendation here proposed by Prof. Aufrecht seems to me to admit of no doubt.

P. 831. l. 11. (VIII. 91, 6.) There was no necessity for changing, as Prof. Aufrecht does, the reading of the MSS. यासा उर्वरा into या सोर्वरा, यासा reproducing the words of the text, namely, या and असौ. B. has असौ च या. In line 12. too the reading of the MSS. अयो अथापि च is unobjectionable, and ought not to have been changed. B. has अयो अपि च.

P. 831. l. 23. (VIII. 91, 7.) निष्कर्षणेन पूत्वा १. A., Ca., and C. Mill have निष्कर्षणे वा. B. leaves out निष्कर्षणेन, and reads पूत्वा शोधयित्वा.

P. 831. l. 25. (VIII. 91, 7.) The last extract from the Sátyáyana is very corrupt, and the text as printed by me differs materially from that of Prof. Aufrecht. I shall first give the readings of the MSS.

तां खे रथस्याध्यवृहत्ता मोर्द्धाभवत्तां खे नसेनसो त्ववृहत्ता संश्लिष्टकाभवत् A.

तां खे रथस्या व्यवृहत्ता मोर्द्धाभवत्तां खे नसेनसो त्ववृहत्ता संश्लिष्टकाभवत् Ca.

तां खे रथस्याध्यवृहत्ता मोर्द्धाभवत्तां खे नसो त्ववृहत्ता संश्लिष्टकाभवत् C. Mill.

Prof. Aufrecht has introduced the following conjectures:

तां खे रथस्यासाद्य वृहत्तामोर्द्धाभवत्तं खेनस आसाद्य वृहत्ताम संश्लिष्टकाभवत्<sup>a</sup>.

I do not think that I understand the meaning of the passage as here given

<sup>a</sup> Prof. Aufrecht informed me that सामसंश्लिष्टका in one word was a misprint.

by Prof. Aufrecht, nor do I see how the Brihatsāma comes suddenly in, though nothing is said of it in Sāyaṇa's comment. I believe that in बृहत् we must recognise the verb *bṛih*, "to drag," "to pull," and with अति this would be synonymous with अतिकृष्, as used immediately afterwards. Thus the construction would be, "he dragged her through the hole of the chariot, she became this; he dragged her through the hole of the cart, she became that." But what did she become? What is मोह्ना, and what संश्लिष्टका? As the first skin that came off was शल्यकः, i. e. a hedgehog, and the second a गोथा, i. e. an iguana, it might be said that when she had been dragged through the first hole, she, having thrown off the hedgehog skin, had become a गोथा, an iguana, and this गोथा might stand for मोह्ना. But if this be so, then it would follow that after the second pulling through, she, having lost the iguana skin, became a कृकलास, i. e. a chameleon, and of this no trace is to be discovered in संश्लिष्टका. Here then we must wait till new MSS. of Sāyaṇa can be procured, or till the original of the Sātyāyanaka can be discovered.

P. 832. l. 3. (VIII. 91, 7.) सूक्तं. A. युक्तं, Ca. यूक्तं, C. Mill सूक्तं. The sense requires सूक्तं, and युक्तं in Prof. Aufrecht's text is probably a misprint.

These few notes on one short hymn may serve as a specimen of the difficulties, some of them insurmountable, with which an editor of Sāyaṇa has to grapple. Before I could make up my mind to give up the extracts from the Brāhmaṇas as hopeless, I looked not only through the whole of the Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa, but I searched wherever there was a chance of finding the story of Apālā. Unfortunately the MS. of the Nītimanjari, which is very useful for verifying legends mentioned by Sāyaṇa, is very deficient in the sixth Aṣṭaka, and does not contain the story of Apālā. The Rīgvidhāna gives one verse, of no interest whatever, viz. कन्या वारिति सूक्तं तु सततं नियतो जपेत् । त्वग्दोषिणीं तथा लोभ्नीं क्षिप्रं तस्मात्प्रमुच्यते ॥ (Read नियता, दोषिणी, and अलोभ्नी).

Again, the Brihaddevatā offers but little help. I copy the text from two MSS. in my possession:

अपालात्रिसुता त्वासीत्कन्या त्वग्दोषिणी पुरा<sup>a</sup> ।  
 तमिन्द्रश्चक्रमे दृष्ट्वा विजने<sup>b</sup> पितुराश्रमे ॥  
 तपसा बुबुधे सा तु सर्वमिन्द्रचिकीर्षितम् ।  
 कन्या वारिति चैतस्यामेघोऽर्चः कथितस्ततः ॥  
 सा मुषाव मुखे<sup>c</sup> सोमं सुत्वेन्द्रमानुहाव तं ।  
 अस्त्री य एषीत्यनया पपाविन्द्रश्च तन्मुखात्<sup>d</sup> ॥  
 अपपांश्चैव सक्तंश्च भक्षयित्वा स तद्वहात्<sup>e</sup> ।  
 उदकुंभं समादाय अपामर्धे जगाम सा ॥<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup> परा B.

<sup>b</sup> की<sup>o</sup> H.

<sup>c</sup> मुखात् H.

<sup>d</sup> सा मुषाव मुखे सोमं पपाविन्द्रश्च तन्मुखात् ॥ B.

<sup>e</sup> शतक्रतुः H.

<sup>f</sup> Deest in H.

चुग्भिस्तुष्टाव सा चैनं जगादैनं तृचेन तु ।<sup>a</sup>  
 सुलोमाननवद्यांगिं कुरु मां शक्नु<sup>b</sup> सुत्वचं ॥  
 तस्यास्तद्वचनं श्रुत्वा प्रीतस्तेन पुरंदरः ।  
 रथच्छिद्रेण तामिन्द्रः शकटस्य युगस्य च ॥  
 प्रक्षिप्य निश्चर्क्य त्रिः सुत्वक् सा तु ततोऽभवत् ।<sup>c</sup>  
 तस्यास्त्वगपहता या पूर्वा सा शल्यकोऽभवत् ॥<sup>d</sup>  
 उत्तरा त्वभवद्गोधा कृकलासस्त्वगुज्जमा ।  
 इतिहासमिदं<sup>e</sup> सूक्तं त्वाहनुयास्त्वभागुरी ॥<sup>f</sup>  
 कन्येति शौनकस्त्वेन्द्रं पातमित्युत्तरे च ये ।<sup>g</sup>

The last work to be consulted was Shadguruśishya's commentary on the Sarvānukrama, but here too we find but little that is really valuable:

कन्य वाः समावेय्यपालेतिहास ऐन्द्र आनुष्टुभं द्विपञ्चादि । अवापती ।<sup>h</sup> अपाला नाम चुषिकात्रिपुत्रिका ।<sup>i</sup> इंद्रम-  
 धिकृत्वापाला नाम तपश्चचार ॥ सो मा ना म समानन्ति ।<sup>k</sup> ऐन्द्र इतिहासः । अत्रोच्यत इति शेषः । इतिहासस्त्वयं ।<sup>l</sup>

अपालात्रिसुता त्वासीत्कन्या त्वग्दोषिणी पुरा ।  
 अत एव दुर्भगेति भर्ता तत्का सती पपि ॥ १ ॥  
 सौम्याद्रसादिन्द्रतृमिपति यज्ञस्य वाक् श्रुतेः ।<sup>m</sup>  
 अन्विच्छती सोमलतां जलायावतरत्तदा ॥ २ ॥<sup>n</sup>  
 सोममप्यविदत्कन्या अथागात्पितुराश्रमं ।<sup>o</sup>  
 तामिन्द्रश्चकमे दृष्ट्वा<sup>p</sup> विजने पितुराश्रमे ॥ ३ ॥  
 तपसा बुबुधे सा तु सर्वमिन्द्रचिकीर्षितं ।<sup>q</sup>  
 सुपाव स्वमुखे सोमं खेदितैर्ग्रीवभिरिविति ॥ ४ ॥  
 तस्या भक्त्यतिरेकेण पपाविन्द्रश्च तन्मुखात् ।<sup>r</sup>  
 निरगात्स्वच्छचित्पूर्वं भक्षयित्वा ग्रहात्पुनः ॥ ५ ॥<sup>s</sup>

<sup>a</sup> चुग्भिस्तुष्टाव चैवेनं सोममिन्द्र तृचेन सा । H.

<sup>b</sup> शुक् B. <sup>c</sup> ततः सा सुत्वचाभवत् । H. K.

<sup>d</sup> तस्यां त्वचि व्यपेतायां सर्वस्यां शल्यकोऽभवत् H.

<sup>e</sup> निमं H. <sup>f</sup> रिः B. यास्तुमातरौ H.

<sup>g</sup> शौनकः सूक्ते पातमिन्द्रे ततः परे । H.

<sup>h</sup> The commentator always gives the word immediately following the pratika.

<sup>i</sup> This passage is very corrupt. The MS. of the E. I. H. (A.) reads अपाला नाम चुषिका अपुत्रिका यां मधिहृत्य अपाला नाम, (B.) अपाला नाम चुषिका कन्या अत्रिपुत्रिका । यामधिकृत्वापाला नाम. *Putrikā*, if correct, must not be taken in the sense of *putrī*, cf. Goldstücker, s. v. *aputrika*. One might conjecture कायमधिकृत्य, 'for the sake of her body;' but, with reference to p. 827. l. 19, I prefer इंद्रमधिकृत्य. Instead of चुषिका one expects चुषिः, cf. Rv. V. 28.

<sup>k</sup> This is equally corrupt. I have given the text of A.; B. has माना समानन्ति । It may be the beginning of the story in the Śātyāyana-Brāhmaṇa, followed by इत्यामन्ति ।

<sup>l</sup> B. has ऐन्द्र इतिहासः । इंद्रसंबंधीतिहासः । अत्रा-  
 वगतव्य इति शेषः । इतिहासश्चायं । A. has अत्रोच्यत  
 and इतिहासत्वाय ।

<sup>m</sup> This is printed after B.; A. differs considerably, without being more intelligible, तृमिरिन्द्र इति यज्ञस्तुत्युपायो भूत् ।

<sup>n</sup> This is again printed from B.; A. has अनिच्छती सोमयात्रं कृतांजलायावतरत्तदा ।

<sup>o</sup> A. has कन्याद्योगाद्यन्पितुराश्रमं ।

<sup>p</sup> दृष्ट्वा A., and B. sec. man., instead of दृष्ट्वा.

<sup>q</sup> A. has साश्रुपात मुखे सोमं खेदितै° etc.

<sup>r</sup> ययामिन्द्रश्चतुर्मुखात् A.

<sup>s</sup> निरगात्स्वच्छचित्पूर्वं तु भक्षयित्वा ग्रहान्पुनः । A.



उदकुम्भं समादाय तेन सार्धं तु साय्यगात् ।  
 ऋग्भिः स्तुत्वा जगादिन्द्रं कुरु मां सुत्वचं त्विति ॥ ६ ॥  
 रथच्छिद्रे गतामिन्द्रः शकटस्य युगस्य च ।  
 प्रक्षिप्य निश्चकर्ष त्विः सुत्वक् सा तु ततोऽभवत्<sup>b</sup> ॥ ७ ॥  
 तस्याः पूर्वहता या त्वज्जातिः<sup>c</sup> सा शल्यकोऽभवत्<sup>d</sup> ।  
 उत्तरा त्वभवद्दोषा कृकलासस्तपोहनेति<sup>e</sup> ॥ ८ ॥

P. 832. l. 27. (VIII. 92, 2.) गाथायोग्यं ॥ गाथायोग्यं A. Ca. \*

P. 833. l. 2. (VIII. 92, 2.) लोटि ॥ लिटि A., Ca., C. Mill. It might be लिङि; see, however, Rv. I. 84, 5. Instead of ध्वनस्त° the MSS. have ध्ववस्त°.

P. 833. l. 12. (VIII. 92, 3.) यत्वा ॥ All the MSS. have दत्वा.

P. 833. l. 20. (VIII. 92, 4.) इंदोः ॥ Instead of इंदोः and क्षरत् A., Ca., C. Mill have इंद्रः and क्षरंतं.

P. 836. l. 9. (VIII. 92, 11.) तवादातृन् ॥ तव दातृन् A. Ca. तव शतृन् B.

P. 836. l. 18. (VIII. 92, 12.) औह्वा° ॥ The MSS. have औह्वा°. This term can only refer to Pān. VI. 1, 93. One should expect आह्वा°, but औह्वा° may be intended for आ + औह्वा°.

P. 836. l. 26. (VIII. 92, 13.) सृष्टके after वज्रवत्सिद्धि in A. Ca. सृष्टके C. Mill.

P. 839. l. 13. (VIII. 92, 23.) Cf. VIII. 13, 18.

P. 840. l. 14. (VIII. 92, 24.) कुक्षये ॥ तुनहु A., Ca., C. Mill.

P. 840. l. 21. (VIII. 92, 25.) सौति ॥ नौति A. Ca.

P. 841. l. 13. (VIII. 92, 27.) समीपास्त्रां ॥ मृगपात्रां A., Ca., C. Mill.

P. 842. l. 14. (VIII. 92, 30.) भाष्यत ॥ A., Ca., C. Mill. तंद्रयुक्तमित्युक्तं ॥ A., Ca., C. Mill.

P. 842. l. 16. (VIII. 92, 31.) कर्मवन्ति ॥ कर्मवतो A. B. Ca.

P. 844. l. 7. (VIII. 93, 1.) एतादृशानुभावं ॥ एतादृशं अनुभवि A. Ca.

P. 844. l. 25. (VIII. 93, 3.) वस्तस्य A. B. Ca. As to this peculiar use of the genitive, see VIII. 93, 1.

P. 845. l. 8. (VIII. 93, 4.) तदा ॥ A., Ca., C. Mill; there is no यदा to which this तदा answers.

P. 846. l. 1. (VIII. 93, 6.) ये सोमाः ॥ ते सोमाः सुनोतेः कर्मणि लिटि व्यत्ययेन षुः । इहः - - A. Ca. This grammatical explanation which was intended to account for the absence of reduplication in सुन्विरे was probably a marginal note and afterwards inserted in the text.

P. 846. l. 15. (VIII. 93, 7.) The grammatical explanation of वाजयामसि was likewise a marginal note. A. reads खाविष्टवदि खेरिष्टवद्वावात् टिरिति टिलोपः । विन्मत्तोर्लुक् । विक - - - यमिति वचनान्मतुपो लुक्. Ca. and C. Mill have the same, only leaving out वि in विक - - -. I have corrected the passage according to Rv. I. 4, 9.

<sup>a</sup> पानार्थे पयमप्यगात् । A.

<sup>b</sup> सुत्वक् सद्यः स वै भवत् A.

<sup>c</sup> तायस्त्व A.

<sup>d</sup> शल्यको B. शल्यका A.

<sup>e</sup> तपो दामे A.

P. 847. l. 5. (VIII. 93, 9.) वज्र आयुधं ॥ वज्रायुधं A. Ca.

P. 848. l. 23. (VIII. 93, 14.) परिगमिता ॥ वनिगमिता A., Ca., C. Mill.

P. 851. l. 9. (VIII. 93, 20.) गच्छतु ॥ गच्छति A. Ca.

P. 851. l. 17. (VIII. 93, 21.) भवामीति ॥ ब्रवामीति A. Ca. भवामिति C. Mill. ददामि इति B.

P. 852. l. 10. (VIII. 93, 23.) उक्तं ॥ उक्त A. Ca. The lacuna is the same in A. Ca.; in C. Mill the letters र-वि have disappeared.

P. 852. l. 13. (VIII. 93, 23.) विसृजंति ॥ विसृजन् A. Ca. विसृजन् B., C. Mill.

P. 852. l. 18. (VIII. 93, 24.) हविर्भिः ॥ हविः A., Ca., C. Mill.

P. 852. l. 20. (VIII. 93, 24.) वादिषु A. - - वादिषु Ca., C. Mill.

P. 853. l. 19. (VIII. 93, 27.) The commentary to verse 27. is left out in A., Ca., C. Mill; it is supplied from B.

P. 854. l. 23. (VIII. 93, 31.) श्रुतेऽत्रापि ॥ श्रुते तत्रापि A. Ca. श्रुतेन तत्रापि C. Mill.

P. 855. l. 15. (VIII. 93, 34.) From धत्तन to धत्तन supplied in accordance with Rig-veda I. 20, 7.

P. 857. l. 18. (VIII. 94, 5.) तना । ततमूर्णास्तुकेनेति ॥ तना तत मूर्णास्तुको नति A. Ca. सनातन मूर्णास्तुकेनेति C. Mill. The reading which I have adopted is conjectural and very doubtful. ऊर्णास्तुका and स्तुका are always used as feminines in the sense of 'a braid of hair.' Cf. Boehtlingk-Roth, s. v., and Dr. Haas, Indische Studien, V. p. 237: Satap. Br. III. 2, 1, 13; III. 5, 2, 18, etc. In the Ait. Br. I. 28, Sáyana explains ऊर्णास्तुकाः by असंसंबंधिरोमविशेषाः । स्तुपः; however, which is likewise used in the sense of 'a braid' (Dr. Haas, l. c.), is certainly a masculine, and it is possible therefore that स्तुका was likewise used in that gender. It hardly admits of a doubt that Sáyana wrote स्तुकेनेति, for the reading of A. Ca. was likewise intended for स्तुकेनेति. The copyists were evidently ignorant of the word ऊर्णास्तुका, and changed it into मूर्णास्तुकेनेति. Sáyana does not give the same or a similar explanation of तन् in other passages where तना पूत occurs.

P. 858. l. 2. (VIII. 94, 6.) सेवां ॥ सवां A., Ca., C. Mill.

P. 860. l. 21. (VIII. 95, 2.) After पिव C. Mill adds यद्वा क्रियाग्रहणमपि कर्तव्यमिति संप्रदानं चतुर्थ्यर्थे बहुलं धी तदिदं सोमरूपमन्नं शीघ्रं पिव ।

P. 861. l. 6. (VIII. 95, 3.) मरुद्गणानां ॥ मरुत्सोमानां A. Ca. मरुत्समानानां B. मरुत्संशानां?

P. 862. l. 3. (VIII. 95, 5.) प्रज्ञां पुरातनं । The variation in the gender is kept up throughout, though the carelessness of the copyists sometimes disturbs the accurate construction of the commentator. B. has प्रज्ञां पुरातनं चतस्रस्य सत्यस्य संबन्धि पिप्पुषीं प्रवृद्धं चिकित्स्वित्मनसं ज्ञानिनं अतीन्द्रियार्थदर्शनेन ज्ञातानि सर्वेषां हृदयानि यया तां तादृशं धियं त्वदीयं रक्षणार्थं तस्मै कुरु ॥

P. 864. l. 2. (VIII. 95, 9.) धनादीनि B. धनकवधनादीनि A. Ca. कनकवधनादीनि C. Mill.

P. 864. l. 24. (VIII. 96, 1.) वेदाध्ययनादीनि B. वेदाध्ययनानि शास्त्रश्रवणः चिंतयादीनि Ca. A.

P. 866. l. 18. (VIII. 96, 4.) After सत्त्वानां A. Ca. add सत्त्वानां । The derivation varies; it is either from षण or षद्.

P. 865. l. 6. (VIII. 96, 5.) The same quotation occurs in Devarájayajvan's commentary on the Nighaṇṭu, MS. E. I. H. 1134, p. 45. a. He derives नदी from नद् अव्यक्ते शब्दे, and adds नदंति नद्यः । Then follows यददः संप्रयतिरभावे नदता भरिते । तस्मादाद्यो नाम स्थेति श्रुतिः । A. Ca. read अनुदत, C. Mill संप्रयतिः.

P. 868. l. 20. (VIII. 96, 8.) नवसु गणेषु ॥ ववसु A. वसु Ca. सुर C. Mill.

P. 868. l. 18. (VIII. 96, 8.) सन्न सन्न निपादिताः ॥ सन्न सन्नतिपादिताः A. Ca. सन्न तिपादिताः C. Mill.

P. 868. l. 18. (VIII. 96, 8.) पद्यो गणः ॥ पद्ये गर्भाः । A. पद्यो गर्भाः Ca., C. Mill. See Vájasaṇeyi-Sanh. XVII. 85, 86.

P. 871. l. 16. (VIII. 96, 13.) लुरुन्मति ॥ लुरुन्मति Bṛihaddev. MS. B.

P. 871. l. 17. (VIII. 96, 13.) योत्समानं सुसंहृष्टैः ॥ योत्समानं स्तु A. Ca. योत्समानस्तु C. Mill. The MSS. of the Bṛihaddevatá, H. and B., have योत्समानं सुसंहृष्टैः ।

P. 871. l. 18. (VIII. 96, 13.) तानायतः । MSS. Bṛihaddev. H. and B. तानायुतान् A., Ca., C. Mill.

P. 871. l. 20. (VIII. 96, 13.) After देवान्पुनर्विभो the MSS. of the Bṛihaddevatá add श्रुत्वा देवगुरोर्वैक्वमनर्थं वृत्तशंकरा ।

P. 871. l. 20. (VIII. 96, 13.) ओजसैव बलाद्वली ॥ MS. Bṛih. B. शक्ः खड्ग एव बलान्वलैः A. शक् खड्ग एव लोः C. Mill. शक्ः खड्ग एव बलान्वलैः । Ca. शक् नै जै स्वैव बलाद्वली MS. Bṛih. H.

P. 871. l. 21. (VIII. 96, 13.) देवानादाय त पपुर्विधिवत्सुराः ॥ MS. Bṛih. B. देवाय ना या य तं पुनर्विधिवत्सुरा । A. देवपानाय ? देवा ना या य तं पुनर्विधिवत्सुरा । Ca., C. Mill. दे वा ना तं य यु वि धि वत्सुराः । MS. Bṛih. H.

P. 871. l. 21. (VIII. 96, 13.) जम्बुः पीत्वा C. Mill, MSS. Bṛih. H. and B. जम्बुः पत्वा A. Ca.

P. 871. l. 22. (VIII. 96, 13.) एतदनार्थत्वे नादरणीयं A., Ca., C. Mill. The whole passage from the Bṛihaddevatá seems to have been here inserted by a later hand. It is not given in B., but it could hardly be called anársha, being taken from the Bṛihaddevatá.

P. 871. l. 26. (VIII. 96, 13.) उदस्य A., Ca., C. Mill, B.

P. 873. l. 17. (VIII. 96, 16.) त्रेवाशुभ्यः ॥ त्रेव शत्रुभ्यः A., Ca., C. Mill.

P. 878. l. 18. (VIII. 96, 18.) छंदोविषयत्वान्निपातनं ॥ छंदोविषयत्वान्निपातन A., Ca., C. Mill. See Amara-kosha III. 4, 18, 113.

P. 883. l. 3. (VIII. 97, 13.) सर्वदिक्स्थं ॥ सर्वदिक्स्थं A., Ca., C. Mill.

P. 884. l. 15. (VIII. 98, 1.) नृमेधस्य ॥ नृमेधास्य A. pr. man., Ca. नृमेधास्यस्य C. Mill.

P. 887. l. 2. (VIII. 98, 6.) दस्योः ॥ B.; A., Ca., C. Mill insert वृथाकालस्य.

P. 890. l. 18. (VIII. 99, 3.) करोति भागं ॥ A. B. Ca. insert अन्ते before भागं ।

P. 890. l. 20. (VIII. 99, 3.) रश्मयः ॥ In the second explanation A., Ca., C. Mill have अयः instead.

P. 891. l. 23. (VIII. 99, 6.) अययंत ॥ The Sanhitá and Pada MSS. have distinctly अ; S. 3. had अ, which was corrected in red ink. The commentary, however, has अ; A., B., C. Mill distinctly; Ca. less distinctly.

P. 892. l. 11. (VIII. 99, 7.) जेतारं etc. ॥ A. leaves out all between जे - and वर्षयितारं ।

The lacuna is supplied from Ca. and C. Mill, which agree with each other except that Ca. has गंगारं for गंतारं. B. has an independent interpretation, as often, आशुं शीघ्रमांगतारं शृङ्गां जेतारं हेतारं देवानामाह्वातारं रथीतमं रथिनां मध्ये श्रेष्ठमनूतं स्वाश्रितानामहिंसकं etc.

P. 893. l. 3. (VIII. 100, 1.) In A. and Ca. all between अनुष्ठुभः, in the quotation from the Sarvānukrama, and ते पशौ यद्वाग्वदंतीति, in the first Vinīyoga, is left out. In C. Mill the lacuna extends from आत्मानमस्तौदिति to वाग्देवत्ये ।. As these introductory passages are always wanting in B., the passage had to be supplied by conjecture.

P. 893. l. 7. (VIII. 100, 1.) After इति तिस्रः A. Ca. have ग्रणवो याज्या । सनये वयं साम ये वयं सामनोज्ञा वचः; C. Mill has याणसमये वयसामनोज्ञा वचः.

P. 895. l. 21. (VIII. 100, 6.) भवति C. Mill. वेति A. Ca. B.

P. 898. l. 10. (VIII. 100, 12.) The verses of Śaunaka are taken from the Bṛihaddevatā. The MSS. of the Bṛihaddevatā contain some various readings, such as अभितप्य for अभिवृत्, उद्यतस्यैव, etc., but they give no help for the last verse. MS. B. has तदेतदखिलं सर्वमृविणोक्तं सत्तेनृचि; MS. H. has तदेतदखिलं प्रोक्तं सखे विष्णुविति नृचि ।. Śāyana has इति द्वचेति.

P. 898. l. 19. (VIII. 101, 1.) तृतीया गायत्री ॥ तृतीया हि गायत्री A. Ca. B. तृतीयात्री C. Mill. In the quotation from the Anukramanī all the MSS. have तृतीयादि. The Bhāṣhya says; प्रगायस्य चतुर्थ्याः सतोवृहतीत्वं दुर्लभमिति सतोवृहतीवचनं ।.

P. 904. l. 12. (VIII. 101, 14.) तथा चैतस्य ब्राह्मणं ॥ I have not been able to verify the first extract. There is an analogous passage in the Taittirīya-Saṁhitā III, 1, 1, but it throws no light on our passage. A. Ca. leave out all from इमा प्रजाः to अर्कमभितो- I had to supply the omission from C. Mill and C. Wilson, which give this: प्रजा. त्तिस्तो अथायमांस्तानीमानि वयांसि वंगावगध्यश्चेरपादा न्यन्या अर्कमभितो विप्र इति ता इमाः प्रजा अर्कम°. The next extract is from the Śatapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa, but it will be seen that it would not have been safe to correct it either after the text of the Mādhyandina or after that of the Kāpva-śākhā. Instead of स प्रजा असृजत ता A. Ca. have स तृजेता, C. Mill स मृजेता. Instead of बृहत् the Śatapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa has महत्.

P. 908. l. 28. (VIII. 102, 12.) हतशतृजनं ॥ C. Mill. हे शतृजननं । A. ह शतृजननं Ca. शतृहननं B.

P. 909. l. 21. (VIII. 102, 16.) धीतिभिर्निधानैः ॥ C. Mill. दीधितिभि निधानः । A. Ca. धीतिभिः दीभिभिः निधानः B. धीतिभिर्निधानः ?

P. 910. l. 14. (VIII. 102, 19.) वनन्वति काष्ठानि हंति ॥ वनन्वती काष्ठानि हंति A. Ca. वनन्वति काष्ठानि संति C. Mill.

P. 911. l. 4. (VIII. 102, 21.) यत्काष्ठदिकं ॥ A. Ca. B. leave out all from काष्ठदिकं to काष्ठदिकं.

P. 911. l. 17. (VIII. 103, 1.) The Sarvānukrama has ककुभ्रसीयसी; C. Mill has ककुब्गायत्री, A. and Ca. ककुब्गयेत्री. The name hrāsīyasī belongs to the 9th class of Gāyatrī, consisting of 6 + 6 + 7 syllables.

P. 911. l. 21. (VIII. 103, 1.) There is an evident omission in the second Vinī-

yoga. The Tṛicha which is optional for the Maitrávaruṇa priest at the Ábhiplavika Ukthya's, if it is taken from our hymn, can only have consisted of verses 8, 9, 10; no other verses, as far as I am aware, being enjoined by Áśvaláyana for such a purpose. We ought therefore to insert प्र मंहिषयेति after नैत्रावरुणस्य, and अग्निं प्रयांसि वाहसा प्र मंहिषाय गायत । अ० ७. ८. । इति । after सूत्रितं च. From the Sūtra quoted by Sáyana it is clear that he referred likewise to a third Viniyoga, namely, the Adhyáyopákarana, in which the first and last verses of each Maṇḍala are enjoined. The text might be restored as follows, उपाकरणोत्सर्जनयोर्निडलाद्यंतहोम आग्ने याहीत्येषा । सूत्रितं च । आग्ने याहि मरुत्सखा यन्ने राजञ्छ्रुतं हविः । अ० गृ० ३. ५. । इति ॥ It is impossible, of course, to restore by conjecture the very words which Sáyana used, and I have therefore not inserted them in the text. But that they were on the whole like what I propose to read is confirmed by the commentary to the first hymn of the 9th Maṇḍala. Here, after other Viniyogas, it is expressly stated उपाकर्तृणि मंडलादिग्रहण आद्या । सूत्रं पूर्वमेवोदाहृतं । The MSS. give no help. A. Ca. read मा त्तिदाग्ने, C. Mill मा चिदाग्ने; अग्ने इति at the end is found in all, instead of अग्ने इति.

P. 914. l. 23. (VIII. 103, 9.) बहुवारं ॥ B. बहु सलिलं A., Ca., C. Mill.

## VARIETAS LECTIONIS.

### *MSS. for the Eighth Aṣṭaka.*

1. A. Colebrooke's MS.
2. A D. A MS. lent me by Dr. Bhao Daji. It is an A. copy, but more carelessly written than Colebrooke's; it offers no original readings.
3. C Mill (C 2). Dr. Mill's MS. which was copied for him at Calcutta from different originals, represents in this portion the A. class. The copyist has occasionally been enabled to supply independent readings, either conjecturally or by consulting other MSS.
4. C Wilson (C 4). This MS. was removed from the Bodleian Library, so that I could not consult it for critical passages. From what I know of it, however, in its earlier portions, it is not likely to yield any independent readings.
5. B 4, Taylor's MS. This MS. has been much read and corrected in the last Aṣṭaka. In its original text it agrees with A; the corrections and numerous marginal notes come from a B. source.
6. Ca. My own MS. Though very carelessly written, it is of the greatest value, as containing not only readings independent both of the A. and B. classes, but as supplying passages which are omitted in all other MSS.
7. B 1. Stevenson's copy.
8. B 2. Burnouf's copy, taken from Stevenson's MS. I transcribed the tenth Maṇḍala at Paris, and finished it on the 30th of May 1846. As I traced the whole of it, my copy is, I believe, perfectly trustworthy, even at this great distance of time.
9. B 3. A modern copy, a mere repetition of B 1. (See vol. II. p. vi.)
10. M. Another B. copy, sent to me by Dr. Haug from India. It was derived from B 1, directly or indirectly, but before B 1. had been corrected with yellow ink. (See X. 56, 1. fin. Here B 1. has sūrya iva iti hi śrutiḥ, but iva is covered over with yellow ink. M. has sūrya iva iti hi śrutiḥ.) This MS. is afterwards replaced in my edition by

11. CB, a MS. lent me by Dr. Bhao Daji, beautifully written, agreeing generally with M, but here and there supplying corrections and marginal notes. In the passage quoted before, it has *sūrya iva iti hi śrutiḥ*.

The three representative MSS. for the eighth Aṣṭaka are : A., Ca., and B 1. Of these A. is generally supported by C Mill and B 4. *primā manu*; Ca. stands by itself; B 1. is supported by B 2, afterwards by CB, sometimes by B 4. *sec. manu*. In difficult passages the A. readings were checked by AD; the B. readings by B 3.

Page 1. line 16. (X. 46, 1.) महान् गुणैः पूज्यः A. महान् गुणैः पूज्यमानो विद् Ca. गुणैः पूज्यैः B 1. 2. M.

P. 1. l. 16. (X. 46, 1.) वेत्ता ॥ वैत्ता Ca. ज्ञाता A. B 1. 2. M.

P. 1. l. 17. (X. 46, 1.) वेद्यां A. Ca.; deest in B 1. 2. M.

P. 1. l. 18. (X. 46, 1.) अर्पां समीप इत्यर्थः Ca. अपसामित्यर्थः A. B 1. 2. M.

P. 1. l. 19. (X. 46, 1.) अथवा Ca.; deest in A. B 1. 2. M. Ca. sec. man. places यद्वा also before कर्मणामुपस्ये.

P. 1. l. 20. (X. 46, 1.) पुनः प्रार्थितः A. B 1. 2. M.; पुनः deest in Ca.

P. 2. l. 3. (X. 46, 1.) Dr. Taylor's MS. (B 4) gives the following independent commentary on verse 1: होता देवानां माह्नाता जातः प्रादुर्भूतः यतः नभोविद् प्रथमनभस आकाशस्य वेदितवान् अतः महान् सर्वभ्यो भूतेभ्यः प्रथममाह्ने आदिभूतत्वेन महत्त्वं नृषडा । नृषु मनुष्येषु जठराग्निरूपेणावस्थितवान् । होतु-रनेरुभयोलोकयोरेव वावस्थानं । नभोविदित्वेन नभसि । अपामुपस्ये अद्भिः सह स्थाने । विद्युदूपेण । एवंरूपोऽग्निः पृथिव्यभ्रेजसु प्रादुर्भूतः । दधिः पृथिव्यभ्रेजसो धारकत्वेनापि च यः । स एव वसूनि विधत्ते । वसूनां यन्ता । यो नियन्ता भवति । स एव विदधातुं शक्नोति । तनूपाः । तनूनां देवमनुष्यादिशरीराणां पाता रक्षकः सो स्मभ्यं शरीरपोषकानि वसूनि विदधातु । इत्याशास्महे ॥

P. 2. l. 9. (X. 46, 2.) सथस्ये सहस्थाने Ca. sec. man.; deest in A. B 1. 2. 4. M.

P. 2. l. 9. (X. 46, 2.) निगूढं Ca.; deest in A. B 1. 2. 4. M.

P. 2. l. 9. (X. 46, 2.) परिचरन्तं Ca. A. B 4; deest in B 1. 2. M.

P. 2. l. 12. (X. 46, 2.) विलीनं A. Ca. B 4. विलीनां B 1. 2. M.

P. 2. l. 13. (X. 46, 2.) स्तोत्रैः Ca.; deest in A. B. 1. 2. M. स्तोत्रादिहविर्भिर्धनमिच्छन्तो B 4.

P. 2. l. 13. (X. 46, 2.) आत्मन इच्छन्तो ॥ अनिमिषन्तो Ca. आत्मानमिच्छन्तः A. B 1. 2. M.

P. 2. l. 14. (X. 46, 3.) पलाय्यासु Ca. पलायासु A. पलाभू B 1. 2. M. पलायमानस्यासु B 4.

P. 2. l. 14. (X. 46, 3.) अग्रा भूमिः । तस्या भूम्या मूर्धनि । भूम्यामित्यर्थः । तत्ताविदत् लब्धवान् । सोऽग्निः Ca. आग्न्या भूम्या मूर्धनि भूम्यामित्यर्थः । तत्ताविदत् लब्धवान् सोऽग्निः A. अग्न्याः भूम्याः मूर्धनि भूम्यामित्यर्थः तत्ताविदत् लब्धवान् सोऽग्निः B 4; but altered into अविदत् प्राप ततः. अग्राया गोमूर्धनि अविदत् प्राप ततः B 1. 2. अग्राया गोमूर्धनि अविदत् प्राप्तवन्तः M.

P. 2. l. 24. (X. 46, 3.) सुखस्य वर्धयिता सन् Ca. A. B 4; but altered into सुखरूपः १; सुखरूपः B 1. 2.

P. 2. l. 26. (X. 46, 3.) यज्ञस्यादित्यस्य वा Ca. आदित्यस्य यज्ञस्य वा A. B 1. 2. M. सुखस्य यज्ञस्य वा B 4.

P. 3. l. 7. (X. 46, 4.) Ca. leaves out the words between आहवनीयं and अध्वराणां.

P. 3. l. 7. (X. 46, 4.) Ca. reads नेतारं प्रापयितारं. A. B 1. 2. M. have नेतारं अरतिं गंतारं. B 4. had अरतिं गंतारं, but नेतारं added sec. man.

P. 3. l. 17. (X. 46, 5.) जेतव्यान्शतृज्यंतं ॥ जेतव्यान् Ca. B 1. 2. M. जेतव्यं A. शतृन् जयंतं B 4.

P. 3. l. 18. (X. 46, 5.) भूर्जयंतमित्येकं पदं कृत्वा भूरादीन् लोकाञ्जयंतमिति व्याचकार ॥ भूर्जयंतमिति (एकं पदमिति marg.) कृत्वा etc. Ca. भूर्जयंतमिति एकदमिति मत्वा etc. A. भूर्जयंतं इति मत्वा भूरादीन् जयंतमिति व्याचकार B 1. 2. (भूरादीन् M.) उद्गीथे भूर्जयंतमित्येकपदं मत्वा etc. B 4. In his commentary on the Sāma-veda Sāyana adopts the same division of words. There he says, प्रेत्यं जयंतमित्यनेन संबंधयितव्यः भूः प्रथमैकवचनमिदं द्वितीयैकवचनस्य स्थाने दृष्टव्यं.

P. 3. l. 24. (X. 46, 5.) प्रीणधनस्तुतिं ॥ प्रीणनस्तुतिं Ca. A. B 4. प्रीणवस्तुतिं B 1. 2. M.

P. 4. l. 12. (X. 46, 6.) B 1. 2. M. add an explanation of अयंतैः, viz. सकारोऽधिव्याचक्रः । तेनायमर्थः । अधिकानां शतृणां यंताः नियमानानि तैः सह शतृनिग्रहं कुर्वन्तित्यर्थः ।

P. 4. l. 22. (X. 46, 7.) श्वेतिमानमंचतः ॥ श्वितिमानं चयंतं Ca. श्वेतिमानमंचतः A. श्वेतिमाचयंतः B 1. 2. M. श्वेतिमानमंचतः B 4. No explanation of अचनयः. Although the substantive *śvetiman* does not occur in Wilson, nor in Boehtlingk's Dictionary, it is correctly formed according to Pāṇ. V. 1, 123.

P. 5. l. 7. (X. 46, 8.) रक्षणाय A. Ca. B 4. रक्षणाणि B 1. 2. M.

P. 5. l. 8. (X. 46, 8.) मंद्रं स्तुतुं A. Ca. B 4. मंद्रं मादनोयं B 1. 2. M.

P. 5. l. 9. (X. 46, 8.) यष्टुतमं वा ॥ Instead of this, Ca. alone reads यजमाना धातुमिवादधिरे, but in the margin यष्टुतमं is written, to fill the place from य to मि.

P. 6. l. 19. (X. 47, 1.) वृक्षवृत्तिभ्यां A. Ca. B. Cf. Pāṇ. II. 1, 3; Rv. Bh. vol. III. p. 272. l. 26.

P. 11. l. 8. (X. 48, 3.) From देवा मयि to कुर्वन्ते the text is given from Ca. A. has nothing but वृत्तादिवधादिरूपेण कर्मणा आर्यंति गच्छन्ति । अर्यंतिर्गतिर्कर्म । यद्वा अर्थ ईश्वरं कुर्वन्ति । B 1. the same, except वृत्तवधादि°. M. has आर्यतिर्गतिः°. B 4. gives after संपादितवान्, केन कृतेन कृत्वेन वृत्तादिवधादिरूपेण कर्मणा । तथा देवासः देवाः मयि क्रतुं अपि वृजन् । संपादितवन्तः । वृत्तादिवधार्थं नम अनीकं सैव्यं कर्म प्रज्ञा वा सूर्यस्येव दुष्टरं मां अर्यंति गच्छन्ति अर्यंतिर्गतिर्कर्म । यद्वा अर्थमीश्वरं कुर्वन्ति ॥

P. 13. l. 4. (X. 48, 7.) खलनिष्पादने यथा ॥ खलनिष्पादने A. Ca. खलनिष्पादने B 4. sec. man. °ने न; खलनिष्पादनेन B 1.

P. 16. l. 10. (X. 49, 3.) इदानीमिव कृतानीत्यनुवदति A. इदानीमेव अचानुवदति Ca. इदानीमेव कृतान्यनुवदति B 4. इदानीमेव क्रियत इत्यनुवदति B 1.

P. 16. l. 22. (X. 49, 4.) प्रदेशं B 1. देशं A. Ca. B 4. pr. man. Should it be प्रदेशनं?

P. 17. l. 9. (X. 49, 5.) प्रहं करं A. B 4. प्रहमकरं Ca. नष्टं मृत्युं आयके करं B 1. As all the MSS. of Sāyana give अडभावश्छांदसः it is clear that Sāyana read आयवे करं. The MSS. of the Pada text, however, give अकरं.

P. 22. l. 16. (X. 50, 5.) अम गत्यादिषु । औषादिक अतन्मयः । छांदस उमादेशः ॥ अम गत्यादिषु औषादिक अतन्मयः छांदस उरादिरादेशः । A. (B 4. sec. man. कस्तन्म, and ओमादेशः.) अम गत्यादिषु औषादिक अतन्मयः छांदसः उमादेशः Ca. ओमन्नादिषूणादिको तन्मयः छांदस उवडादेशः M. ओमन्नादिषु औषादिको तन्मयः । छांदस ऊडादेशः B 1.

P. 23. l. 19. (X. 51, 1.) सौचिको नामाग्निः । B 1. सौचीको नामाग्निः B 3. A. सोचीको नामाग्निः Ca. The MSS. vary in the same manner whenever this name of Agni occurs. The MS. of the Anukramanī (E. I. H. 132) has सौचीकः; the commentary (E. I. H. 1823)



has likewise सौचीकः. The MSS. of the Brihaddevatâ vary. MS. B. reads अभिचक्राम सौचीको भयादग्निरिति श्रुतिः १. MS. H. (a fragment) reads अपचक्राम देवस्यः सौचिकोऽग्निरिति श्रुतिः १. सूचिकः, in the sense of tailor, is given by Wilson, Râdhakant, and in the Gaṇa-pâṭha, with the short *i* only. In writing सौचीकः I am guided chiefly by the authority of the Anukramanî, though unfortunately the commentary does not in this case give an etymological and grammatical explanation.

P. 26. l. 6. (X. 51, 5.) संमत्ता १. It would be better to write तव संमत्ता.

P. 26. l. 21. (X. 51, 6.) तौदादिकः A. Ca. B. In the Dhâtupâṭha ओविजि is रौधादिकः.

P. 27. l. 12. (X. 51, 9.) प्रधानस्य प्रमुखे । A. B 1. 4. प्रधानहविषोऽग्रे Ca. sec. man.

P. 27. l. 19. (X. 51, 9.) शरीरदाया ह वा अग्नयो ॥ शरीरदायादा ह वा अग्नेया B 4. शरीरदायादा ह वा अग्नयो A. शरीरदाया ह वा अग्नयो Ca.; deest in B 1.

P. 28. l. 25. (X. 52, 2.) अनुज्ञातव्यं A. B 1. 4. अनुज्ञातव्यं Ca.

P. 29. l. 1. (X. 52, 2.) किंच सा स इत्यर्थः B 1. 4. Ca. किंच सासमित्यर्थः A. I feel doubtful about this passage. Sâyaṇa may have intended a reference to some formula used in the Rîtvig-varaṇa. Thus Âśvalâyana (Grihya-sûtra I. 23) gives चंद्रमा मे ब्रह्मा स मे ब्रह्मा ब्रह्माणं त्वामुं वृषे as the words used by the sacrificer in appointing his Brahman, while the answer of the Brahman is चंद्रमास्ते ब्रह्मा स ते ब्रह्मा ब्रह्माहं ते मानुषः १. As the commentary stands, it would seem to mean simply that she, viz. samit, is he, viz. Candramâḥ.

P. 29. l. 3. (X. 52, 2.) तदेवोभयं भवतीति ॥ तदेवाभयं भवतीति Ca. तदेवाभयं तीति A. ते देवा भवतीति हि B 4; deest in B 1.

P. 31. l. 25. (X. 52, 3.) जीवति मृतशब्दो जायते तस्य ॥ जीवति सति प्र याजायते तस्याः Ca. जीवति सति मृतशब्दो जायते तस्य B 3. जीवति प्र याजा जायते तस्या B 1. जीवति प्र या जायत तस्याः A. सुरभय एव यस्मिञ्जीवे मृतशब्दस्त्वमाने Âśvalâyana. य आहिताग्निर्जीवे मृतशब्दं श्रुत्वा का तत् प्रयाश्चित्तिरिति Ait.-Br. VII. 9.

P. 32. l. 24. (X. 53, 4.) जुषध्वं सेवध्वमिति । एवं बहूच्यमानेऽग्निमनूद्यंति सर्वे देवा ॥ जुषध्वं इति सेवध्वं । एवं बहू व्याम अग्निमनूद्यंति सर्वे देवा Ca. जुषध्वं सेवध्वमिति एवं बहूच्यमान अग्निमनूद्यंति सर्वे देवा B 4. A. जुषध्वं इति एवं बहूच्यमाने अग्निमनूद्यंति सर्वे देवा B 1. The text is corrupt, and requires emendation.

P. 33. l. 17. (X. 53, 6.) अग्न्यंतराले श्चातिक्रमण ॥ अग्निं नरो लेख्यातिक्रमण A. अग्नि नरो वेद्यतिक्रमणे B 4. marg. अस्संतराले श्चातिक्रमणे Ca. अग्नि नरो वेति द्यभिक्रमणे B 2.

P. 34. l. 18. (X. 53, 7.) युष्मदीयान्नयान् A. B 4. M. अस्मदीयान्नयान् Ca.

P. 34. l. 19. (X. 53, 7.) प्रियमस्मान् Ca. प्रियमाल्लान् A. B 4. M.

P. 36. l. 10. (X. 53, 11.) ते मरुतो A. B. तेऽमी मरुतो Ca. त च्चुभवो?

P. 37. l. 7. (X. 54, 1.) देवानां रक्षणेन B 4. Ca. °रणेन A. निवारणेन M.

P. 38. l. 11. (X. 54, 4.) उत्तरसूक्ते उपात्यवर्जिते दूरे तन्नामेत्यादिषु ॥ उत्तरसूक्तेषु उत्पद्यंते वर्जितेषु दूरे तन्नामेत्यादिषु B 4. उत्तरसूक्ते उपात्यवर्जितेषु दूरेषु तन्नामेत्यादिषु Ca. उत्तरसूक्तेषु उत्पद्यंतवर्जितेषु इत्यादिषु M.

P. 39. ll. 17, 19. (X. 55, 1.) वयोधै S. 1. 2. S. 3. had वयोधैः, but the Visarga was struck out. Both Pada MSS. have वयोऽधै. It is the same in X. 67, 11. Here, too, S. 3. seems to have had वयोधैः, though this is not quite clear. The other

MSS., S. 1. 2, and the two Padas have again वयोधै. Professor Aufrecht gives वयोधै: in both places. This is an impossible form, as there is no such word as vayodha.

P. 39. l. 24. (X. 55, 1.) अवेत्य ॥ आहेत्य M. अहेत्य A. B 4. Deest in Ca.

P. 39. l. 25. (X. 55, 1.) निधानार्थे A. निधनार्थे B 4. M. Deest in Ca.

P. 40. l. 2. (X. 55, 1.) At the end of verse 1, B 4. adds: इति विद्युदूषेद्र इति च वाजसनेयकं यद्वा पर्जन्यस्य रूपमाह तदानां वायुरस्येन्द्रस्य भ्रातावगंतव्यः ॥

P. 40. l. 10. (X. 55, 2.) After उत्पादितवानसि A. has भूतभव्योभयान्वयाययेत्यर्थस्यावृत्तिः 1. B 4. C Mill भूतभव्योभयान्वयाय ये ते त्वर्थस्यावृत्तिः. M. inserts in the same place भयादयमर्थं स्यात्. Ca. is wanting. येनेत्यस्यावृत्तिः would be better.

P. 40. l. 12. (X. 55, 2.) After प्रियभूतं Ca. inserts संतरिक्षं आ अपूर्णादिति वर्तते । प्र त्वं जातं etc.

P. 41. l. 11. (X. 55, 4.) सत्यौच्छः ॥ One expects यद्यौच्छः, but the relative is left out here in all the MSS.

P. 41. l. 25. (X. 55, 5.) अननमनः प्राणनं ॥ अननं प्राणनं A. अनेन मनः प्रीणनं M. B 4. अनेन मनः प्राणनं Ca.

P. 41. l. 25. (X. 55, 5.) सम्यगननोपेते A. सम्यगनेनोपेते M. B 4. सम्यगमननोपेते Ca.

P. 42. l. 1. (X. 55, 5.) जरा Ca. B 4, struck out afterwards. Deest in A. B. C Mill.

P. 43. l. 1. (X. 55, 7.) महतेद्रेण Ca. महता तद्रेण A. B 1. 4. M. C Mill.

P. 45. l. 5. (X. 56, 3.) अनु गाः । अनुगच्छ । M. अनु गाः । अन्वगाः । अनुगच्छ । B 1. अनु गाः । अन्वगाः । गच्छ । A. B 4. Ca.

P. 46. l. 20. (X. 56, 6.) संबन्धिनं A. Ca. B, instead of संबन्धि, an inadvertence, it would seem, of Sāyana's.

P. 46. l. 21. (X. 56, 6.) जैस्त्रिः A. Ca. B, instead of जैस्त्रिः. The same form in Dr. Roer's edition, and in MS. E. I. H. 1980.

P. 47. l. 22. (X. 57.) Sāyana does not notice a passage in the Anukramanikā at the beginning of this hymn. The Anukramanikā says, पराणि चत्वारि सूक्तामुक्ता ऋषयो द्वैपदे त्वद्विमंडले i. e. "The Rishis mentioned in the Dvipada portion in the Atri-maṇḍala saw the next four Śūktas." This refers to Maṇḍala V. 24, where the four Gaupāyanas or Laupāyanas are mentioned as Rishis.

P. 48. l. 1. (X. 57, 1.) The extract from the Śāṭyāyanaka has been fully discussed in the Preface to vol. V. It seemed a useful passage for proving the existence of the three families of Sāyana's MSS., which had been called in question, and for showing, at the same time, the result that can be obtained by a strict application of the principles of diplomatic criticism. It has been objected that, according to these principles, I ought not to have restored राघप्रौढे, because none of the MSS. have it. This would be true, but for the fact that we have here to deal with a proper name, which can only be either right or wrong, and where therefore the authority of the MSS. must yield to the authority of independent facts. प्रौढ, by itself, is impossible, and could not be connected

with राज्ञ. Again, if the first syllable has a long vowel, we cannot read रचप्रोष्ठे, but must admit a patronymic राजप्रोष्ठे. प्रोष्ठः is a word of doubtful meaning. It occurs in the Gaṇapāṭha (śivādi), where it is followed by प्रोष्ठिक. The commentary to Pāṇ. V. 4, 120, explains प्रोष्ठः by गौः, ox. See also Pāṇ. VII. 3, 18. Wilson gives the meanings of carp and ox. The Amara-kosha gives proshṭhi as the name of a fish, and the commentary adds proshṭhaḥ as a masculine in the same sense. Rādhakānta gives the following extract : द्वे पूर्वभाद्रपदोत्तरभाद्रपदासु प्रोष्ठो गौः भद्रश्च गौः (cf. Hemachandra, 1257) तस्यैव पाद आसां तास्यथा । पूर्वे प्रोष्ठपदे द्वे उत्तरे तु भाद्रपदे द्वे समुदायश्चासां चतुः संख्य इति बहुवचनं । कदा पूर्वे प्रोष्ठपदे कदा उत्तरे प्रोष्ठपदे इति तारकयोर्वित्वादिवचनं । इति भरतः । In the Rig-veda प्रोष्ठ occurs once more in VII. 55, 8, in प्रोष्ठेश्याः, which Sāyaṇa explains by प्रंकखे श्यानाः. In hymn 60, verse 5, रचप्रोष्ठेषु is used as another name for Asamāti and his family.

Again, the passage from तं ह स्नानग्नौ to परावभूतुः is evidently corrupt, and it has been remarked that I ought to have restored it conjecturally. But my object was the very opposite of conjectural restoration. It was to show how far in a passage, where we could not hope for external help, a strict adherence to the rules laid down by Lachmann and other classical scholars, would lead us. I ought, however, as pointed out by Professor A. Weber, to have given more weight to the reading of Ca. in असुरातं. Though this is not the reading towards which the three families of Sāyaṇa's MSS. point, yet my own MS. Ca. frequently holds an independent position, and would suggest the reading असुरातं. I need hardly mention that the spaces in तुल्य रूपे and अंतः परिधि are too large, and that the Avagraha before निधाय should be omitted.

P. 48. l. 22. (X. 57, 2.) प्राप्नुयाम ॥ प्रोष्ठोति A. Ca. B 1. 4. M.

P. 49. l. 6. (X. 57, 3.) केषनं । See Kātyāyana Śrauta-sūtra IX. 13, 35.

P. 49. l. 18. (X. 57, 5.) Sāyaṇa seems to have taken पितरः as a nominative, and to have read जनः instead of मनः.

P. 51. l. 24. (X. 58, 7-10.) A. has no commentary, but simply states, यत्ते अप इति यत्ते सूवेमिति यत्ते पर्वतानिति यत्ते विश्वमिति चतस्र कृचो निगदसिद्धाः । The same in B, C Mill. B 4. has the same, except its reading यत्ते विश्वमिदं जगदिति etc. Ca. reads : सप्तमी । यत्ते अप इति । अष्टमी । यत्ते पर्वतानिति । नवमी यत्ते विश्वमिदं जगदिति । दशमी । एकादशी । यत्त पराः परावत इति । चतस्र कृचः निगदसिद्धा पंचम्यां पराः परावत इत्यंतं दूरदेश इत्यर्थः ॥ षष्ठां भूतं च भयं चेत्यनेन etc. The text as given is taken from M.

P. 53. l. 2. (X. 58, 12.) The separate mention of the वर्तमान must be supposed to lie in the words इह क्षयाय जीवसे । All the MSS. give प्रपंच as a neuter.

P. 53. l. 26. (X. 59, 1.) निर्वृतिः पापदेवता A. B 4. निर्वृतिः प्राणदेवता Ca. निर्वृतिदेवता B 1. M.

P. 54. l. 7. (X. 59, 2.) जीर्णो स्तोता वा । जरा स्तुति ॥ जीर्णोस्तुतिः जरास्तुतिः A. B 1. 4. जीर्णो स्तोता वा जरास्तुति Ca.

P. 55. l. 13. (X. 59, 5.) संदर्शने ॥ संदर्शन A. Ca. B.

P. 56. l. 20. (X. 59, 9.) हिनस्तु ॥ मा आगच्छतु M. म आगच्छतु B I. हिनस्तु A. C Mill. हिनस्तु Ca. हिनस्तु sec. man. मे आगच्छतु B 4.

P. 57. l. 21. (X. 60, 1.) सुवंधोर्जीविताह्वानरूपोऽर्थो देवता A. B 4. सुवंधोर्नाम जीवितायां ह्वानरूपो यो देवता । Ca. सुवंधोर्जीविताह्वानरूपो र्था देवता B I.

P. 57. l. 22. (X. 60, 1.) After स्पृशन्हेतुभूतो the word हस्तः might be repeated.

P. 58. l. 16. (X. 60, 2.) तस्य after शतुः deest in A. Ca. B I. 4. Possibly निययिनं may be a marginal note which was intended for नियामिनं, and meant to be inserted after the first निययिनं. B 4. has indeed नियमिनं (sic) between निययिनं and रथं.

P. 59. l. 12. (X. 60, 5.) अनयेंद्रमाह्वयेऽसमात्यर्थे ॥ अनयासमातिषु असमात्यर्थे इंद्र M. अनयासमातिषु असमात्यर्थे हे इंद्र B I. 4. अनया इंद्रस्य समा सा त समात्यर्थे तत्रा चत्वारिण Ca. अनया इं मा सने असमात्यर्थे हे इंद्र A.

P. 60. l. 6. (X. 60, 6.) The extract from the Śātyāyanaka is again corrupt. Instead of अथ शेषे A. B 4, B I. and C Mill have अत्र शेषे, M. अत्र चोक्तं, Ca. अत्राशोषशोष.

P. 60. l. 7. (X. 60, 6.) पुनर्वैतुमेत्यवृत्तुन् एषांतःपरिधीत्यव्रवीत् ते मा बध्वमिति तन्निराह । अयं माता Ca. पुनर्वैतुमेत्यवृत्तुनी तमाद ध्वमिति तन्निराह त्रयं माता A. CB. C Mill. पुनर्वैतुमेत्यवृत्तुन् एषांतः परि द ध्वीत्यव्रवीत् तमादध्वमिति तन्निराह त्रयं माता B 4. पुनर्वैतुमेत्यव्रवीत् तमादध्वमिति । तन्निराहं त्रयं माता B I. पुनर्वैतुमेत्यव्रवीत् तमादध्वमिति । तन्निराहं तत्रयं माता M.

P. 60. l. 10. (X. 60, 7.) द्वैपदेन यथातिषु ॥ द्वैपदं यद्वतिषु A. B I. द्वैपदं यद्वतिषु B 4. द्वैपदं यद्वमतिषु Ca. The two MSS. of the Brihaddevatā read द्वैपदेन यथातिषु. Cf. Rv. V. 24.

P. 62. l. 15. (X. 61, init.) सन्नाधिका नाभानेदिष्टो मानवो वैश्वदेवं तदिति ॥ सन्नाधिकेत्सादि B I. CB. सन्नेत्यादि A. C Mill. सन्नाधिका नाभानेदिष्टो मानवो वैश्वदेवं तदि Ca. सन्नाधिका नाभानेदिष्टो मानवो वैश्वदेवे तदिति B 4.

P. 62. l. 17. (X. 61, init.) उद्धृत्य चोत्तरं सूक्तं ॥ उद्धृतं सूक्तं A. उद्धृतं सूक्तं CB. उद्धृत्य चोत्तरं सूक्तं Ca. उद्धृतं च उद्धृतं सूक्तं C Mill. उ - - सूक्तं B I. उद्धृत्य चोत्तरं सूक्तं B 4.

P. 62. l. 17. (X. 61, init.) अत्रैतरेयब्राह्मणं । A. Ca. B I. 4. C Mill. अत्र तैत्तिरीये ब्राह्मणं CB.

P. 62. l. 22. (X. 61, init.) अनुष्टाय मुसंति । CB. B I. अनुष्टाये पर्यनुष्टाये मुसंति A. B 4. pr. man. अनुष्टयानुष्टाये मुसंति C Mill. अनुष्टु चानुष्टाये मुसंति Ca.

P. 62. l. 22. (X. 61, init.) सूक्ते शंसय ॥ सूक्ते ग्नं यते A. सूक्ते संयते B 4. Ca. सूक्ते संयते C Mill. सूक्ते संस्तूय ते CB. सूक्ते संस्तू ते य B I.

P. 62. l. 22. (X. 61, init.) वसिष्ठा गाः ॥ वसिष्ठाः सहस्र° A. Ca. C Mill. वसिष्ठा गा CB. B I. वसिष्ठाः सहस्र° B 4.

P. 62. l. 25. (X. 61, init.) यज्ञं पारं प्रापय ॥ यज्ञपरं पारं प्रापय A. C Mill. यज्ञपां र प्रापय B I. यन्पारं पारं प्रापय Ca. यज्ञपारं प्रापय CB. यज्ञपर पारं प्रापय B 4.

P. 62. l. 25. (X. 61, init.) सहस्रं प्रादुः । तं च तद्गोसहस्रं ॥ सहस्रं प्रादुः ते च तद्गोसहस्रं A. सहस्रं प्रादुः ते च तद्गोसहस्रं Ca. B 4. सहस्रं प्रादुः ते च तद्गोसहस्रं C Mill. सहस्रं स्त्रीकुबीर्यं B I. CB.

P. 63. l. 14. (X. 61, 1.) भागप्रदाने प्रवर्तमाना ॥ भागप्रदाने वर्तमाना A. भागप्रदाने व वर्तमानाः Ca. भागप्रदाने प्रवर्तमाना C Mill, B 4. भागं प्रवर्तमाना CB. B I.

P. 63. l. 15. (X. 61, 1.) गोलाभसाधनत्वेन B 4. गोलाभसाधनत्वेना A. गोलाभसाधन Ca. गोलाभसाधनत्वेना C Mill. ऋणलाभ साधन B I. CB.

P. 63. l. 15. (X. 61, 1.) तेन नाभानेदिष्टः ॥ तेन यज्ञाभा° A. C Mill. तेन यज्ञाभा° B I. 4. Ca. CB.

P. 64. l. 3. (X. 61, 2.) यथा घनः ॥ यथा धनं A. Ca. C Mill. यथा घनं CB. B 1. यथा B 4.

P. 65. l. 16. (X. 61, 5.) After अस्तेः सिपि B 4. Ca. mark a lacuna; not A. B 1. CB. C Mill. It should have been अस्तेः सिपि लडि बहुलं छंदसीतीडभावे हृस्व्यादिना सुलोपः. Cf. Rv. X. 149, 2.

P. 66. l. 25. (X. 61, 8.) As Sāyana would hardly refer द्रवचेताः to Vāstoshpati, he must take it as the subject of a new sentence, connecting it with यः कश्चित्परावृक्. The reading of the MSS. seems corrupt in the passage which follows; and after abhimukham, na should either be added or understood.

P. 68. l. 11. (X. 61, 11.) हे इंद्र ते तुभ्यं Ca. B 4. हे तुभ्यं A. C Mill, B 1. CB. हे रुद्र?

P. 68. l. 12. (X. 61, 11.) पाथोलक्षणं A. C Mill, B 4. पथोलक्षणं B 1. CB. Ca.

P. 68. l. 13. (X. 61, 11.) Before तदोदकं all the MSS. repeat अयजंत. If this were kept, it would have been necessary to write तं रसं यदायजंत.

P. 68. l. 25. (X. 61, 12.) त्वो नामकारणः । Ca. B 4. B 1. CB. त्वा नामकरणः Ca. C Mill. Nāmakarāṇa used in the sense of nominal suffix.

P. 69. l. 13. (X. 61, 12.) धनं जानंति । CB. धनं जानं Ca. धनं न जानंति B 4. A. C Mill. धनं जनानंति B 1.

P. 70. l. 21. (X. 61, 16.) स एवाग्निं । Sāyana seems to have written स एवाग्निः and to have continued in the nominative हविर्वोदुमशक्तः सन्. Thus we have स एवाग्निः हविर्वोदुमशक्तः सन् A. C Mill. स एवाग्निः CB. B 1. 4. सोम एवाग्नि हविर्वोदु अशक्तः सन् Ca.

P. 71. l. 11. (X. 61, 19.) द्विजा विप्रा चतस्य प्रथमजाः सत्यस्य प्रथमजाः सत्यभूतस्य ब्रह्मणः प्रथमोत्पन्नाः ॥

{ द्विजाः विप्राः चतस्य प्रथमजाः सत्यभूतस्य ब्रह्मणः प्रथमोत्पन्नो (sec. man. ज्ञाः) B 4.

{ द्विजा - - - चतस्य प्रथमजाः सत्यभूतस्य ब्रह्मणः प्रथमोत्पन्ना Ca.

{ द्विजाः चतस्य तस्य प्रथमजाः सत्य प्रथमजाः सत्यभूतस्य ब्रह्मणः प्रथमोत्पन्ना A. C Mill.

{ द्विजाः चतस्य प्रथमजाः सत्यस्य प्रथमजाः सत्यस्य भूतस्य ब्रह्मणः प्रथमोत्पन्नाः CB. B 1.

P. 71. l. 20. (X. 61, 20.) श्रेणिर्न शिशुः शंसनीयो ॥ श्रेणिः न शिशुः नसेतेन B 4. श्रेणिः न शिशुः नसेनेन A. C Mill. श्रेणिर्न शिशुः नसनेनेन CB. B 1. श्रेणि ना सनेन Ca.

P. 76. l. 26. (X. 62, 1.) बहुवचनं । This is the reading of all the MSS., instead of what we should expect परस्मैपदं. Sāyana may, however, with regard to the immediately following verses, have considered the second person plural (ज्ञानश्) irregularly put for the third person plural, and in that case, the reading of the MSS. might be explained. All the MSS. have प्राज्ञः स्य, but B 1. and CB. have ज्ञानशरे, B 4. ज्ञानशिरे sec. man., which reading occurs also in the Niti-manjarī.

P. 79. l. 12. (X. 62, 7.) चृषयोऽगिरस etc. This passage, though apparently taken from the Brihaddevatā, is not to be found in any MSS. of that work. Instead of तत्पुण्या च कर्मणि A. B 4. and C Mill read कर्मणि, Ca. CB. B 1. कर्मणि. We might read तत्पुण्याणि च कर्मणि.

P. 80. l. 16. (X. 62, 10.) परिणसौ A. C Mill. Instead of this, B 1. B 4. CB. and Ca. have परिणद्धपशू गोभिः.

P. 81. l. 12. (X. 63, 1.) पृथ्वाभिप्रवयोस्तृतीयेऽहनि वैश्वदेव एतत्सूक्तं वैश्वदेवं निविद्वानं ॥

- { पृथ्वाभिप्रवयोऽहयो स्मृताति हनि वैश्वदेवशस्त्रे एतत्सूक्तं वैश्वदेवनिविद्वानं । Ca.  
 { पृथ्वाभिप्रवयः षष्ठहयोस्तृतीये हनि वैश्वदेवे निविद्वानं B 4. एतत्सूक्तं वैश्वदेवं in marg.  
 { पृथ्वाभिप्रवयोः तृतीये हनि वैश्वदेवे एतत्सूक्तं वैश्वदेवनिविद्वानं A.  
 { पृथ्वाभिप्रवयोः तृतीये हनि वैश्वदेवे एतत्सूक्तं वैश्वदेवनिविद्वानं C Mill.  
 { पृथ्वाभिप्रवयोः तृतीये हनि वैश्वदेवे एतत्सूक्तं वैश्वदेवं निविद्वानं B 1.  
 { पृथ्वाभिप्रवयोः तृतीये हनि वैश्वदेवे एतत्सूक्तं वैश्वदेवं निविद्वानं CB.

P. 81. l. 19. (X. 63, 1.) ज्ञातेयं A. C Mill, B 1. CB. B 4. ज्ञातैः Ca.

P. 88. l. 10. (X. 63, 15.) With regard to the Viniyoga, see Rv. I. 189, 1.

P. 91. l. 5. (X. 64, 3.) गंतुमशक्यं ॥ गूहितुमशक्यं?

P. 91. l. 17. (X. 64, 4.) रो मत्वर्थीयः ॥ रो मत्वर्थीयः A. C Mill. शब्दाद्धरो मत्वर्थीयः B 4. sec. man.

हविष्यश्च रो मत्वर्थीयः Ca. शब्दा स्वरो मत्वर्थीयः CB. B 1. Cf. X. 64, 16; 99, 6. Sāyana takes *tuviravān* either as derived from *tuvi* by means of two possessive affixes, viz. *ra* and *vān*, meaning "possessing many," i.e. praisers; or he takes *ra* as a possessive affix, attached to *tuvi*, *tuviṛa* meaning "possessing manifoldness," and referring to the gods, to which a new possessive suffix is added, viz. *vān*, giving to the compound the meaning of "united with those who are possessed of manifoldness." It is not possible to read *pratyayāvr̥tiḥ*; first, because the MSS. are unanimous against it; secondly, because *āvr̥tiḥ* is never used as a technical term for loss or disappearance.

P. 94. l. 20. (X. 64, 10.) ततः शशमानस्य शंसमानं स्तोतृबोऽस्मान्पातु ॥ ततः शशमानस्य शंसमानं स्तोतु नो स्मान्पातु A. ततः शशमानस्य शंसमानं स्तोतुं नो स्मान्पातु B 4. ततः शमानस्य शंसमानं स्तोतुं नां स्मान्पातु C Mill. ततः शशमानस्य तत्समानं स्तोतुं नो स्मान्पातु Ca. ततः शंसमानस्य शंसमानं स्तोतुं नो स्मान्पातु B 1. CB. It might be शंसमानान्, or शंसमानस्य स्तोतुः, if governed by शंसः, but the corruption begins even with ततः. As it is, शशमानस्य would be first explained by the acc. sing. शंसमानं, and this afterwards by स्तोतृन् in order to have a plural for नः.

P. 95. l. 13. (X. 64, 12.) हे मरुतो etc. There has been a misplacement in all the MSS.: A. begins with हे देवाः ये देवाः, C Mill with हे इंद्रा ये देवाः, Ca. B 4. CB. B 1. with हे इंद्रादयो देवाः, and they all continue यां धियं यत्कर्म मे मह्यं दातुमिच्छय, and then only proceed to the invocations हे मरुतः etc. There probably was a lacuna, which was supplied in a marginal note, and this note was afterwards inserted in the wrong place.

P. 101. l. 12. (X. 65, 8.) घरणवत् ॥ लक्षणवत् A. C Mill, B 4. CB. B 1. Ca. reads पितृवत् पयः उदकं पि घतः सिंचत । The same MS. has बहुधाभ्यविकरणत्वेन instead of the आहुतधिकरणत्वेन of the other MSS.

P. 106. l. 26. (X. 66, 5.) त्रिष्कंभं. Although all the MSS. read either त्रिष्कंभं Ca. B 4. or त्रिः कंभं A. C Mill, CB. B 1, and though the same reading त्रिष्कंभं occurs again in X. 66, 7, I have ventured to print त्रिष्कंभं as the nearest approach to what would otherwise be unintelligible.

P. 113. l. 26. (X. 67, 5.) मंत्वं सूर्ये १. This is the reading of all the MSS.; either मंत्वं should be omitted, or at least वा added after सूर्ये.

P. 118. l. 9. (X. 68, 3.) कुसीदेभ्यः ॥ ऊसीदेभ्यः A. C Mill. कुसीदेभ्यः Ca. कुसीदेभ्यः B 4. कुसीदेभ्यः B 1. CB. कुसीदेभ्यः CB. sec. man.

P. 120. l. 24. (X. 68, 9.) वलस्य पर्वणः पर्वतात् ता गा निजैभार । वलेन निजैहार ॥ वलस्य पर्व । वान् भासा निजैभार वलेन निजैहार A. वलस्य पर्ववान् भामा निजैभार वलेन निजैहो C Mill. वलस्य पर्वणः । पर्वतात् भूमौ निजैभार वलेन निजैहार B 4. वलस्य मज्जानं निजैभार वनेन जैहा Ca. पर्वतात् भूमौ निजैभार वलान् निजैहा CB. B 1.

P. 126. l. 22. (X. 69, 10.) प्रतान् ॥ सन्वान् A. C Mill. सन्वान् B 4. Ca. CB. B 1. It may be सन्वान्, but it is more likely that it was meant for प्रतान्.

P. 129. l. 13. (X. 70, 4.) अकारस्येकारवर्णव्यपत्त्याः पश्चादलोपः ॥ अकारस्येकारा वर्णव्यापत्त्या पश्चादलोपः A. ंलोपाः C Mill. ंलोपः B 1. अकारस्य इकारो वर्णव्यापत्त्या पश्चादलोपः Ca. अकारस्येकारो वर्णव्यापत्त्यापश्चादलोपः B 4. sec. man. अकारस्य इकारो वर्णव्यापत्त्या पश्चादलोपः CB. The text is hardly correct. But for the unanimity of the MSS., I should have preferred to write इकारवर्णव्यापत्त्याः पश्चादलोपः, for in the change of drāghimanâ, or, more correctly, drāghimnâ into drāghmâ, the i is first destroyed, and afterwards there is lopa of an, or n. However, Sâyaṇa was evidently satisfied with having explained a form drāghimnâ, without going as far as drāghmâ, and this he does by saying that that allopaḥ of Pân. VI. 4, 134 and 137 takes place after the destruction of the i, for as long as the i was present, the allopaḥ of the akâra could not have taken place.

P. 132. l. 23. (X. 71, 1.) परं १. The MSS. of the Brihaddevatâ have अजरं and अमृतं १.

P. 133. l. 14. (X. 71, 1.) The passage in the Aitareyâranyaka, in the only MS. which I possess, runs as follows: तदिति प्रतिपद्यते तच्चदिति वा अन्नमन्नमेव तदभिप्रतिपद्यत एतां वाच प्रजापतिः प्रथमां वाचं व्याहरदेकाक्षरद्वयं ततेति तातेति तयैवैतत्कुमारः प्रथमवाचं व्याहरदेकाक्षरद्वयं ततेति तातेति तयैव तन्नतवत्या वाचा प्रतिपद्यते । तदुक्तमृषिणा वहस्यते प्रथमं वाचो अग्रमित्येतद्वेव प्रथमं वाचो अग्रं यत्प्रेरत नामधेयं दधाना इति वाचा हि नामधेयानि धीर्यते यदेषां श्रेष्ठं यद्विप्रमासीदित्येतद्वेव श्रेष्ठमेतद्विप्रं प्रेषा तदेषां निहितं गुहाविनिर्दोष ह गुहाध्यात्ममिमा देवता अद् उ आविरधिदैवतमित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति १.

P. 136. l. 26. (X. 71, 7.) The quotation चृच्छंतीव खे उदगंतामिति is explained by Durga by चृच्छंति वै तौ कर्षौ खेऽभिव्यक्ताः संतः शब्दाः । एतावपि च उदगंतां प्रसुद्व्यत इव ग्रहणाय १.

P. 138. l. 17. (X. 71, 10.) प्रतिभूतेन A. C Mill, B 4. CB. B 1. पतिभूतेन Ca. Though patibhûtena might be defended, yet it would be more unusual even than pratibhutenâ. Sâyaṇa probably wrote pratibhûbhûtenâ, or simply सखिभूतेन?

P. 139. l. 7. (X. 71, 11.) कर्षणि प्रयोगं ॥ कर्षणि प्रयोगे A. C Mill, B 4. B 1. कर्षणि प्रयोगेषु Ca. कर्षणि CB.

P. 139. l. 11. (X. 71, 11.) न निघातः ॥ निघातः A. C Mill, B 4. B 1. CB. प्रतिघातः Ca.

P. 141. l. 3. (X. 72, 2.) आदिसृष्टावित्यर्थः A. C Mill, Ca. CB. B 1. आदित्यसृष्टावित्यर्थः B 4.

P. 141. l. 10. (X. 72, 2.) अधिष्ठानसं ॥ अधिष्ठानाः सं A. C Mill. अधिष्ठानं सं Ca. अधिष्ठानात्सं

B 4. अथिष्टानां तत्सकं CB. नां तत्सकं CB. sec. man. अष्टानां तत्सकं B 1. The end of Sâyana's argument is not clear to me.

P. 143. l. 13. (X. 72, 8.) In the Taittirīyāranyaka, where the same or a very similar passage occurs (I. 13, 8), the list ends with इंद्रश्च विवस्वाश्चेत्येते ।.

P. 146. l. 5. (X. 73, 5.) स इंद्रस्तथा अवर्षणेन ग्रापयित्रीर्निहो वृष्टीः प्रावपत् तमांसि च प्रावपत् । व्यनाशयदित्यर्थः ॥  
 स दस्युः तस्माः अवर्षणेन ग्रापयित्रीर्निहो वृष्टीः प्रावपत् व्यनाशयदित्यर्थः । तमांसि ..... A.  
 स दस्युः तस्माः अवर्षणेन ग्रापयित्रीर्निहो वृष्टीः प्रावपत् व्यनाशयदित्यर्थः । तमांसि C Mill.  
 स ह दस्यु तमाः अवर्षणेन ग्रापयित्रीर्निहो वृष्ट्या तस्माः प्रावपद्विनाशयदित्यर्थः । Ca.  
 स दस्युः तस्माः अवर्षणेन ग्रापयित्रीर्निहो वृष्टीः प्रावपत् विनाशयदित्यर्थः । तमांसि B 4.  
 स दस्युः तस्माः अवर्षणेन ग्रापयित्रीर्निहो वृष्टीः प्रावपयत् व्यनाशयदित्यर्थः । तमांसि B 1.  
 स दस्युः तस्माः आवर्षणेन ग्रापयित्रीर्निहो वृष्टीः प्रावपत्तमांसि विनाशयदित्यर्थः CB.

The text is corrupt in all the MSS. First of all, it should be इंद्रः instead of दस्युः, because the act here described, belongs to Indra, not to the Dasyu. But even if we retained दस्युः, the second half of the sentence would be incomplete.

P. 147. l. 5. (X. 73, 7.) After शीघ्रं गतो मार्गं, the MSS. add कांती A. Ca. B 4. CB. कांति C Mill. कांति B 1. गतो मार्गं, which I do not understand.

P. 147. l. 21. (X. 73, 9.) The commentary to verse 9 is left out in all the MSS., it may be seen in Sâyana's commentary to the Sâma-veda, I. 4, 1, 4, 9: अस्सेन्द्रस्य चक्रमायुधमर्षं तस्मिन् आ सवैतो निषत्तं निषत्तमासीन्मेघहननार्थमुतो तदपि चास्मा इंद्राय मध्विदुदकमपि चच्छद्यात् । वशं नयति । पृथिव्यानतिथितं विमुक्तं यद्वधरुदकमस्ति तत्पयो गोघ्नोषधीषु चादधाः । आदधाति ॥

P. 153. l. 5. (X. 75, 4.) सिचौ सिच्यमानो भटौ नयसि उदकपूरयद्यदा A. सिचौ सिच्यमानो भटौ नयसि उदकपूरं पं द्यदा C Mill. सिचौ सिच्यमानौ भटौ नयसि उदकपूरं यद्यदा B 4. सिचौ सिच्यमानौ तदौ नयसि । उदकपूर यद्यदा Ca. सिचौ सिच्यमानौ भये नयसि उदकं पूरयं यद्यदा CB. B 1. It seems impossible to restore the text. I should conjecture something like सिचौ सिच्यमानौ घटौ (पटौ) नयसि । उदकेन पूरयसि.

P. 153. l. 19. (X. 75, 5.) After this verse, CB. inserts in the text: सितासिते सरितो यत् संगमे तत्तां भुतासो दिवमुत्पतंति । ते वै तन्वन्विंसृजंति धीरास्ते जनांसोऽमृतत्वं भजंते ॥

S. 1. reads: सितासिते सरितो यत् संगमे तत्तां भुतासो दिवमुत्पतंति ।

ये वै तन्वन्विंसृजंति धीरास्ते जनांसोऽमृतत्वं भजंते ॥

S. 2. in margine: सितासिते सरितो यत् संगमे तत्तां भुतासो दिवमुत्पतंति ।

एवै तन्वन्विंसृजंति धीरास्ते जनांसोऽमृतत्वं भजंते ॥

The same verse occurs in the Mantra-saṃhitâ, p. 107<sup>b</sup>:

सितासिते सरितो यत् संगमे तत्तां भुतासो दिवमुत्पतंति ।

एवै तन्वन्विंसृजंति धीरास्ते जनांसोऽमृतत्वं भजंते ॥

P. 155. l. 20. (X. 76, 1.) यथा of the text is left out by Sâyana.

P. 156. l. 2. (X. 76, 2.) धृतोऽथ ॥ धूर्तः अथ A. C Mill. धृताश्च Ca. धूर्तः अथ B 4. CB; deest in B 1.

P. 156. l. 3. (X. 76, 2.) बलवान् ॥ बलाति A. C Mill, B 4. Ca. बलाति CB. B 1. बल् might



be a technical term connected with horsemanship, in which case Śāyana may have written बल्लते.

P. 159. l. 2. (X. 77, 1.) On the metre of this hymn, see my Translation of the Rig-veda, vol. I. p. civ.

P. 159. l. 7. (X. 77, 1.) बहुवचनं A. C Mill, Ca. B 4. CB. B 1. Cf. Rv. X. 77, 7.

P. 159. l. 10. (X. 77, 1.) न स्तुतवानस्मीतः पूर्वं ॥ न स्तुतो स्मि इतः पूर्वं A. C Mill, CB. B 1. स्तुतो स्मि इतः इतः पूर्वं B 4. न स्तुतो स्माभि पूर्वं Ca.

P. 160. l. 15. (X. 77, 4.) परिष्कर्तार इव ॥ परिष्कार इव A. C Mill, B 4. CB. B 1. परिष्ठा इव Ca.

P. 160. l. 17. (X. 77, 4.) After सप्त there begins a lucuna in A. and C Mill, extending to X. 78, 1, तर्पयितारो ॥

P. 161. l. 2. (X. 77, 5.) प्रसिद्धयानाः ॥ प्रसिद्धे यो नः Ca. प्रसिद्धयानाः B 4. प्रसिद्धायाना प्रवृद्धयाना B 1. CB.

P. 168. l. 19. (X. 79, 6.) चकर्षे विविधं करोषि ॥ As all the MSS. give this reading, there can be little doubt that the mistake is due to Śāyana himself, who mistook चकर्त for चकर्षे ॥

P. 169. l. 9. (X. 80, 1.) Shadgurusishya, too, says, सौचीको वैश्वानरोऽग्निर्हृदिः । वाविशिष्ट-त्वात् सभिः ॥

P. 172. l. 4. (X. 81, 1.) य इमेति त्रयोदशर्चे द्वितीयं A. C Mill, B 4. (Burn.) य इमेति त्रयोदशर्चे त्रयोदशं Ca. सप्तर्चे त्रयोदशं CB. B 1. In the extract from the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa Śāyana speaks of Brahman as a masculine, ब्रह्मा वै स्वयंभूः A. C Mill, Ca. B 4, the passage omitted in B 1. CB. Weber's edition gives ब्रह्म वै स्वयंभु. The same MSS. leave out भौवन after विश्वकर्मा in the quotation from the Nirukta. See also Taitt. Saṃhitā IV. 6, 2; Vāj. Saṃh. XVII. 7.

P. 173. l. 23. (X. 81, 2.) After °पृथिव्योरुपादानानर्हत्वात् B 1. adds तयोः स्योत्पत्तेः पूर्वमपादानानर्ह-त्वादित्यर्थः । आत्माश्रयप्रसंग इति शेषः ॥ It should be स्योत्पत्तेः पूर्वमु°, but the whole is clearly a marginal note, and there is no trace of it even in CB. It occurs, however, in Burnouf's MS.

P. 173. l. 26. (X. 81, 2.) Instead of the simple किं स्विदासीदिति in A. C Mill, Ca. B 4, we find in B 1. स्वरूपेण किं पदार्थे रूपे ॥ भूदिति प्रश्नार्थः । न किंस्वि°, in CB. स्वरूपेण किं पदार्थे रूपो भूदिति प्रश्नार्थः भिद्या न किंस्वि°. It was probably meant for स्वरूपेण किंपदार्थरूपोऽभूदिति प्रश्नार्थः । न किंस्वि° etc.; or we should write न किंचिदासीदिति ॥

P. 175. l. 17. (X. 81, 5.) The comment to यजस्व is left out in all MSS.

P. 178. l. 21. (X. 82, 3.) तत्त्वदेवेषु Ca. तत्पदेषु A. तत्तत्पदेषु C Mill. तूह्यत्पदेषु B 4. तत्त्वत्पदेषु CB. B 1.

P. 180. l. 3. (X. 82, 6.) The quotation from the Smṛiti seems to be taken from Manu, but it varies from the received text, having akshipat for asrijat, and sūryakoṭīsamaprabham for sahasrāmśusamaprabham. In Mahīdhara's commentary, which agrees very much with Śāyana's, but follows nevertheless its own way, we have aṥhākshipat, and sūryakoṭīsamaprabham.

P. 180. l. 14. (X. 82, 7.) सर्ववेदांतवेद्यं ॥ The same is the reading of the MSS. of Mahidhara, for सर्ववेदांत is only the very common Bengālī spelling for सर्ववेदांत, which Professor Weber has changed to सर्ववेदानं.

P. 180. l. 16. (X. 82, 7.) °कत्वात् नात्यंतं सत् काष्ठापाषाणादिवत्संबोद्धमयोग्यत्वात् ॥ The state of the MSS. is as follows:

- A. °कत्वात् काष्ठापाषाणादिवांतरेण बुद्धमयोग्यत्वात्.  
 C Mill °कत्वात् काष्ठापाषाणादि वांतरेण संबुद्धमयोग्यत्वात्.  
 Ca. °कत्वात्काष्ठापाषाणादि तरेण संबंधमयोग्यत्वात्.  
 B 4. °कः त्वा काष्ठापाषाणादिवदंतरेण संबद्धः अयोग्यत्वात्.  
 B 1. °कत्वात् एवमज्ञानमपि नात्यंतमसत् ईश्वरतत्वावरकत्वात् नापि सृत् बोधमानात् निवर्त्यत्वात्.  
 CB. °कत्वात् एव काष्ठापाषाणादि वांतरेण संबुद्धमयोग्यत्वात्.

It is only by a reference to Mahidhara's commentary to the Yajur-veda that Sāyana's wording can be restored with some kind of certainty. The general conception in both commentaries is evidently the same. Nihāra, fog, is meant for ignorance; and as fog is not altogether nothing, for it impedes the vision, nor altogether something, for it cannot be perceived like wood and stones, so ignorance, too, is not altogether nothing, for it covers the essence of the supreme Lord, nor is it altogether something, for it can be removed simply by understanding. Supposing that Mahidhara wrote काष्ठाश्मादिवद्बोधयितुमयोग्यत्वात्, not, as Professor Weber prints, काष्ठाश्मादिवद्बोधयितुमयोग्यत्वात्, I yet felt unable to make anything of the चंतरेण, which is, however, supported by all MSS. There may have been an addition, to express that fog could not be perceived without something else to which it adhered, possibly Sāyana may have said, that it could not be perceived except as clinging to stones and wood: anyhow, we can go no further in the present state of our MS. materials, and must wait for help from other sources. The verse occurs in the Taittiriya-samhitā, possibly Sāyana's commentary there may remove our difficulties. I retain the neuter sat and asat, because all the MSS. have it.

P. 183. l. 21. (X. 84, 1.) In some respects Sāyana's commentary in Taitt. Brāhm. II. 4, 1, where this verse occurs with slight variations, is better.

P. 187. l. 24. (X. 85, 2.) सोमो नक्षत्राणामेषां । न खं त्रायंत इति नक्षत्रा ग्रहचमसादयः ॥

- A. सोमो नक्षत्राणामेषां न खं त्रायंत इति नक्षत्रा ग्रह वने शुलोके.  
 C Mill सोमो नक्षत्राणामेषां नं ख त्रायंत इति नक्षत्रा ग्रह वने शुलोके.  
 Ca. सोमो नक्षत्राणां न ख त्रायंत इति नक्षत्र ग्रहचमसादयः ।  
 B 4. CB. सोमो नक्षत्राणामेषां न ख त्रायंत इति नक्षत्रा ग्रहचमसादयः.  
 CB. सोमो नक्षत्राणामेषां न क्षत्राणाय त इति नक्षत्रा ग्रहचमसादयः.

I doubt whether the text, as I have given it, is right. I have not been able to trace a similar etymology of nakshatra anywhere else; at all events, it is not more absurd than other etymologies of the same word, proposed by native

scholars. In the commentary to the Sāṅkhâyaṇa-sûtras (MS. meum, p. 124<sup>b</sup>), at the end of the fourteenth Adhyâya, in explaining the Nakshatra-stomas, it is said, नक्षत्राणि ह तेजस्कामानि । एव ग्रह इत्युच्यते.

P. 188. l. 10. (X. 85, 3.) यः पपिवान् मैघुनकामार्थं चिकित्साद्यर्थं ॥ A. यः पपिवानं वै धे नु कामार्थं. C Mill यः पपिवानं वै धे नु कामार्थं. Ca. यः पपिवान न बोधनकामार्थं. B 4. sec. man. यः पपिवान् । वर्धनकामार्थं चिकित्साद्यर्थं. CB. यः पपिवान् पिवान् वर्धनकामार्थं चिकित्साद्यर्थं. B 1. यः पिधान् वर्धन । कामार्थं चिकित्साद्यर्थं.

P. 189. l. 13. (X. 85, 5.) आप्यायस्व समिति प्रातःसवने A. C Mill, Ca. B 4. आप्यायस्व समेति B 1. CB. The full formula ought to be आप्यायस्व समेतु ते: cf. Ait. Br. VII. 33.

P. 191. l. 3. (X. 85, 8.) येनोपश्रोते स ओपशः ॥ येना नो वति स ओपशः A. C Mill. 1या निः नुवंति स ओपशः Ca. येनोपशवति स ओपशः B 4. स म नु षः रुपशः CB. समुषः B 1. Nothing remained but to restore the text conjecturally, and chiefly with reference to VII. 54, 9.

P. 194. l. 12. (X. 85, 16.) विनिदिष्टे ॥ निविचष्टे A. Ca. निवि । चष्टे C Mill. तिविचष्टे B 4. विनचष्टे CB. विनिचष्टे B 1.

P. 197. l. 6. (X. 85, 22.) बृहन्नितंवां Ca. ; deest in A. C Mill, B 4. B 1. CB. The lacuna is indicated in A. B 4, the position of Ca. is very exceptional here.

P. 197. l. 19. (X. 85, 24.) अथास्या योक्त्रं विवृतेत् ॥ अथा योक्त्रं विवृते A. C Mill. अथास्या योक्त्रं विमृतेत् Ca. अथास्या योक्त्रविवृतेत् B 4; deest in B 1. CB. I have corrected the first in accordance with the Kauśika-sûtras (Dr. Haas, Indische Studien, V. p. 384). The yoktra ceremony is not mentioned in Āśvalâyaṇa's Gṛihya-sûtras. The yoktra is not a girdle which is always worn by a lady, but a girdle with which she is girded after she has been bathed, combed, and dressed for the marriage. When the girdle is unfastened again, the servants fight for it. This peculiar yoktra is not mentioned in the Petersburg dictionary.

P. 199. l. 26. (X. 85, 29.) शामुल्यं शामूलमित्यर्थः ॥ शामुल्यं शामुल्यमित्यर्थः A. C Mill, CB. श्यालुल्यं शामुल्यमित्यर्थः B 1. शामुल्यं शामूलमित्यर्थः Ca. शामुल्यं शमलं शरीरं B 4.

P. 199. l. 26. (X. 85, 29.) शरीरावच्छन्नस्य । A. शरीरावच्छन्नस्य C Mill. शरीरां छिन्नस्य CB. छिन्नस्य B 1. शरीरावच्छन्नस्य Ca. शरीरावच्छन्नस्य B 4.

P. 200. l. 22. (X. 85, 31.) यद्वा जनाद्यमाख्यात् ॥ जनात् यत् स्थाख्यात् A. जनात् यख्यात् C Mill. जना यमाख्यात् Ca. जनात् यमाख्यात् B 4. जनात् यमाख्या CB. B 1.

P. 201. l. 24. (X. 85, 34.) अनुपयोग्यं । B 1. 4. Ca. C Mill, CB. अनुपभोग्यं A.

P. 202. l. 6. (X. 85, 35.) तूपाधानं B 1. 4. Ca. CB. तूपाधानं C Mill. रूपाधानं A. The commentary is difficult, but it is quite clear that Sâyaṇa takes âśasanam, viśasanam, and adhivikartanam as parts of female dress.

P. 202. l. 7. (X. 85, 35.) यन्निधा वास्ये A. य धस वास्ये C Mill. यन्निधा वास्ये Ca. यन्निधा वास्ये B 4. यन्निधा वास्ये CB. यन्निधा वसे B 1. This I do not understand.

P. 203. l. 3. (X. 85, 37.) Sâyaṇa's explanation is very extraordinary, but the MSS. leave little doubt. All would be right if the word ūrū, apparently used as a feminine, were simply left out, except where it is the dual. Even after

atyantamangalabhûtâm, most of the MSS. have inserted this ūrū. तां ऊरुं चा ईरयस्व सर्वतः A. तां ऊरुं चा ईरयस्व सर्वतः C Mill. तां एरयस्व चा ईरयः सर्वतः Ca. तां ऊरुं चा एरयस्व सर्वतः B 4. तां ऊरुं अत एव सर्वतः CB. In B 1. all is left out between तां and ऊरु उज्जती. One might conjecture सूरुः, like वामोरुः, but such a word would be too unusual for Sâyaṇa to use. I have left the passage as it is, because it is just possible in yasyâm ūrau to take ūrau as an independent locative.

At the end of X. 85. (VIII. 3, 28.) the following Khila occurs:

अविधवा भवं वधौणि शतं साग्रं तु सुव्रता ।  
 तेजस्वी च यशस्वी च धर्मपत्नी पतिव्रता ॥१॥  
 जनयद्बहुपुत्राणि<sup>1</sup> मा च दुःखं लभेत्कचित् ।  
 भर्ता ते सोमपा नित्यं भवेद्धर्मपरायणः ॥२॥  
 अष्टपुत्रा भवं त्वं च सुभगा च पतिव्रता ।  
 भर्तुश्चैव पितृभ्रातृहृद्दयानंदिनी सदा ॥३॥  
 इन्द्रस्य तु ययेंद्राण्यं श्रीधरस्य यया श्रिया ।  
 शंकरस्य यया गौरी तद्भर्तुरपि भर्तरि<sup>2</sup> ॥४॥  
 अर्धैर्यथानुसूया स्याद्वसिष्ठस्याप्यर्धंती ।  
 कौशिकस्य यया सती तथा त्वमपि भर्तरि ॥५॥  
 ध्रुवैधि पोष्या मयि मह्यं त्वादाद्बृहस्पतिः ।  
 मया पत्यां प्रजावती सं जीव शूरदः शतं ॥६॥

The accents are given from MS. E. I. H. 132 (Colebrooke); they are placed still more at random in other MSS. Cf. Indische Studien, V. 194.

P. 207. l. 4. (X. 86, init.) संविवादं A. C Mill, Ca. सविवादं B 4; deest in B 1. CB: cf. Boehtlingk-Roth, s. v. The Bṛihaddevatâ makes Vṛishâkapi the setting sun, Vṛishâkapâyî the gloaming.

P. 207. l. 13. (X. 86, init.) अग्निद्योमः स्यात्. One expects अग्निद्योमसंस्थः स्यात्. One MS. A. reads अग्निद्यौम स्यात्, which may have been meant for an adjective of अग्निद्योमः.

X. 86, 1. As this passage is important (see Academy, 1874, 31st Jan.), I subjoin the readings of the six principal MSS.:

- B 1. माधवभट्टास्तु वि हि सोतोऽरित्येषा ऋग्मिन्द्राख्या वाक्यमिति मन्यते । तथा च तस्मिन्द्राख्यै कल्पितं हविः  
 CB. माधवभट्टास्तु वि हि त स्तोतरित्येषा ऋग्मिन्द्राख्या वाक्यमिति मन्यते । तथा च तद्वचनमिन्द्राख्यै कल्पितं हविः  
 Ca. माधवभट्टास्तु वि हि सोतोऽरित्येषा ऋग्मिन्द्राख्या वाक्यमिति मन्यते । तथा च तद्वचनमिन्द्राख्यै कल्पितं हविः  
 B 4. माधवभट्टास्तु वि हि सोतोऽरित्येषा ऋग्मिन्द्राख्या वाक्यमिति मन्यते । तथा च तस्मिन्द्राख्यै कल्पितं हविः  
 A. माधवभट्टास्तु वि हि तोरित्येषा ऋग्मिन्द्राख्या वाक्यमिति मन्यते । तथा च तद्वचनमिन्द्राख्यौ कल्पितं हविः ।  
 C Mill. माधवभट्टास्तु वि हि सोतोऽरित्येषा ऋग्मिन्द्राख्या वाक्यमिति मन्यते । तथा च तद्वचनमिन्द्राख्यौ कल्पितं हविः ।

कश्चित्	इदं पुत्रस्य वृषा विषये	वर्तमानस्तत्तैर्द्रुमिन्द्राणीं	वदति तस्मिन् पक्षे त्व सा कृचो यमर्थः ॥
कश्चित्	इदं पुत्रस्य वृषा विषये	वर्तमानस्तत्तैर्द्रुमिन्द्राणीं	वदति तस्मिन् पक्षे त्वस्या कृचो यमर्थः ॥
कश्चिन्मंदो	अदृष्टत् । इन्द्रपुत्रस्य वृषाकपेर्विषये	वर्तमानस्तत्तैर्द्रुमिन्द्राणीं	वदति तस्मिन्पक्षे त्वस्याश्च कृचो यमर्थः ॥
कश्चित्	इदं पुत्रस्य वृषाविषये	वर्तमानः तत्तैर्द्रुमिन्द्राणी	वदति तस्मिन् पक्षे त्वस्या कृचो यमर्थः ॥
कश्चिन्मृगो	दृष्टत् । इन्द्रपुत्रस्य वृषाकपेर्विषये	वर्तमानः तत्तैर्द्रुमिन्द्राणी	वदति तस्मिन्पक्षे त्वस्या कृचो यमर्थः ॥
कश्चित् मणो दु	गूढत् । इन्द्रपुत्रस्य वृषाकापः विषये	वर्तमानस्तत्तैर्द्रुमिन्द्राणी	वदति तस्मिन् पक्षे त्वस्या कृचो यमर्थः ॥

P. 208. l. 12. (X. 86, 2.) व्यधिश्चलितः ॥ व्यधिः चलितः A. C Mill. व्यधिश्चलितः B 4. खलितः Ca. चलतः CB. चलनः B 1.

P. 210. l. 24. (X. 86, 8.) After एकः किञ्चिद्: something is left out, âdarârthah, or atisâyavismayadyotanârthah.

P. 214. l. 15. (X. 86, 17.) The last paragraph अत्र त्वयियस्फुरिद् इन्द्राणीं वदति is left out in all MSS. except Ca. I have inserted it, although it is against the Anukramanî. The Anukramanî, however, has been several times disregarded in this hymn, and there is no other way of removing the vyatireka, and establishing the avirodha of the two verses.

P. 214. l. 24. (X. 86, 18.) उद्भानं ॥ उद्भनं A. उद्भनं C Mill. उद्भतं CB. B 1. उद्भनं Ca. मुद्भनं B 4. सुन is explained by Manu III. 68 to comprehend five paśubadhasthânas, the kitchen-hearth, the grindstone, the broom, the pestle and mortar, the water-pot. The question is, which of these is meant here by Sâyaṇa. The MSS. are of little use, but as the commentary explains the first śunâ, the chullî, by udvahanî, this might seem to be the word intended, only not in the senses ascribed to it by the dictionaries, but in the sense of chullî, hearth. There is, however, another word for hearth, which comes nearer to the MSS., viz. uddhâna or uddhmâna (Am. Kosha II. 9, 29). Still nearer would be uddhava, if it could be proved that this word, too, was used in a technical sacrificial sense. Even musalam would be possible, for this, too, is one of the five śunâs.

P. 215. l. 18. (X. 86, 20.) मृगोद्भास ॥ मृगो वाः स A. Ca. C Mill. मृगोवास° B 4. CB. मृगोवा B 1.

P. 217. l. 1. (X. 86, 23.) At the beginning of this verse the MSS. add : हे इन्द्र विसृज्यमानमनेन मंत्रेण वृषाकपिराज्ञास्ते । A. C Mill, B 4. CB. B 1. हे इन्द्र विसृज्यमानं अनंतरमंत्रेण वृषाकपिराज्ञास्ते Ca.

P. 217. l. 1. (X. 86, 23.) भल is explained as a vocative; शरभ ललतिभे° A. C Mill. शर भलति भे° Ca. शलभ भलतिभे° B 4. शर ल भमिति भे° CB. B 1. Now Śarabha is the name of a monkey in the Râmâyana, besides being the name of a strong fabulous animal, and this might refer to the animal mentioned in the preceding verse. But bhala does not lend itself to this interpretation, whereas by taking bhala for bhalla, Sâyaṇa might explain it by śara, arrow, and derive it from bhalati bhedane, if in Dhâtu-pâṭha 32, 66.

P. 217. l. 10. (X. 87, 1. init.) अंगाराभिहरणे ॥ संहाराभिहरणे A. C Mill, B 4. अहाराभिहरणे Ca.; deest in B 1. CB.

P. 218. l. 3. (X. 87, 2.) मारकव्यापारान् ॥ मारक (ह) व्यवाहन् राक्षसान् B 4. मारक व्यवहन् राक्षसान् A. मारकव्याहन् राक्षसान् C Mill; deest in Ca. B 1. CB; मारव्यवहारान् ?

P. 222. l. 9. (X. 87, 13.) मधरं A. B 1. मधुरं B 4. CB. मधरं C Mill. रामधरं Ca.

P. 228. l. 9. (X. 88, 3.) स्तोषामि A. C Mill, CB; deest in Ca. B 4. and B 1. Probably something is left out by which Sâyaṇa would have traced the theoretical form stoshâmi back to staumi. The form itself, an imperative of the aorist, was probably unknown to him.

P. 230. l. 4. (X. 88, 7.) आभिमुख्येन जुहुवुः ॥ आभिमुख्येनाजुहुवुः C Mill, Ca. B 4. आभिमुख्येन आनुहुवुः A. आभिमुख्येन जुहुः CB. अभिमुख्येनाजुहुः B 1.

P. 234. l. 2. (X. 88, 16.) उत मन्येऽहमेनमनयोहिं ॥ उत मन्ये ह मेनमनयोहिं A. उत मन्ये हमेनमनयोहिं C Mill. उत मन्ये दमे मम तयोहिं Ca. उत मन्ये हमेनमनयोहिं B 4. उतमे हन्यमे नस मायोगे CB. I cannot find the passage; if metrical, there are two syllables wanting.

P. 234. l. 14. (X. 88, 17.) After वेत्ति one expects इति.

P. 237. l. 7. (X. 89, 4.) The MSS. insert अंतरिक्षं च after सगरस्य, and all have प्रेरयानि (sic).

P. 241. l. 12. (X. 89, 14.) यद्यदा हेत्या—यद्यदा च शक्त्या ॥ यद्या lacuna च शक्त्या A. यद्यदा च शक्त्या C Mill, CB. यद्यदा व शक्त्या B 4. यद्या च शसनस्थाने B 1. Ca. only has the passage, and reads, यद्यदा हेत्या त्वमद्यस्य द्वितीयार्थे षष्ठी । अभूतमेवद्युद्धार्थमागच्छद्रुद्धो भिनहो भिनदः यद्यदा च शक्त्या.

P. 243. l. 4. (X. 90, 1.) As this is a hymn which has been much read, owing to its bearing on Vedânta doctrines, the MSS. are full of corrections and marginal notes. Sâyaṇa's text, however, is not affected by them.

P. 245. l. 17. (X. 90, 5.) माययेति ॥ ययेति B 1. CB. यये वेति A. पयेवेति C Mill. तथौ वक्ष्यति Ca. य एवं वेदेति B 4. sec. man.

P. 252. l. 3. (X. 91, 4.) The lacuna at the end of verse 4 and the beginning of verse 5 occurs in all the MSS. The fifth verse occurs in the Sâma-veda II. 3, 2, 7, 1, but the commentary there affords little help towards restoring the original reading of Sâyaṇa.

P. 254. l. 21. (X. 91, 11.) Another explanation of हविष्कृति is given in Ca. उत वा अपि वा हविः कृतिर्यस्मिन् तद्यज्ञमनुतिष्ठतीति शेषः Ca. उत वा अपि वा हविष्कृति हविषां कृतकरणं यस्मिन् स हविष्कृत् तस्मिन्ने हविषि ददातीति संस्कृतिर्यस्मिन् तद्यज्ञमनुतिष्ठतीति शेषः A. C Mill, B 4. (कृतं करणं). CB. B 1. (कृतं करणं and ददातीति स हविष्कृत् यस्मिन् तद्यज्ञमनुतिष्ठतीति शेषः).

P. 255. l. 21. (X. 91, 13.) अनुप्रवेश भवेति A. C Mill. अनुप्रवेशो भवति Ca. अनुप्रवेशो भवेति B 4. अनुप्रविष्टो भवेति CB. B 1.

P. 261. l. 12. (X. 92, 11.) Sâyaṇa takes rodasî either as a singular or dual, regardless of the Pada-text; and he excels himself in taking chaturāṅgo narâśamsaḥ as a locative. Ca. has चतुर्भिर्विज्ञो गिनस्तस्मिन्नराशंसो.

P. 261. l. 22. (X. 92, 12.) बोधतं, 2nd pers. dual, is explained by बुध्येतां, a possible 3rd pers. dual opt. Parasmaipada, instead of the Âtmanepada of बुध्यते. This बुध्येतां might have been taken for the 3rd pers. dual imperat. Âtman., but immediately after, where Sâyaṇa inserts yuvâm, and where therefore a 2nd pers. dual is

necessary, the MSS. again give बुधेतं, which, though it might be changed to बुधेतां, cannot be changed to बुधेयां.

P. 262. l. 9. (X. 92, 13.) The same lacuna occurs in all the MSS. I have only changed कामयमान into नं, without attempting conjectural emendation, though it would be easy to do so; अन्नमभि प्राप्नुं । अन्नमयमन्नं कामयमानमिति शेषः । अर्चत । स्तुत ।

P. 262. l. 18. (X. 92, 14.) पत्नुरपत्यं तत्वेना° ॥ पत्नुरपत्यं तत्वेना° A. पत्नुरपत्यं तत्वेना° C Mill. पत्नुरपत्यं तत्वेना° B 4. sec. man. पत्नुरपत्यं तत्वेना° CB. पत्नुरपत्यं तत्वेना° B 1. पत्नुरपत्यं तत्वेना° Ca.

P. 263. l. 10. (X. 93, init.) As Sāyana evidently took the name of the author to be तान्त्रः पार्थः it has been left so. He derives पार्थः from पृथुः, and even in the last verse where तान्त्रः पार्थः occurs, he takes पार्थः as a separate word. The Anukramanî, however, reads पार्थः, and the commentator explains पृथोरपत्यार्थे स्थत्.

P. 266. l. 2. (X. 93, 7.) वायुश्च A. C Mill, Ca. B 4. pr. man. सूर्यश्च B 4. sec. man. B 1. CB.

P. 266. l. 11. (X. 93, 8.) प्रति शीघ्रं ॥ All MSS. omit यज्ञं before प्रति; B 4. sec. man. changes the unintelligible प्रति into अति.

P. 266. l. 23. (X. 93, 9.) चक्रं रथस्य चक्रं रश्मिं न । चक्रादिकं । तद्वदित्यर्थः ॥ चक्रं रथस्य चक्रं रश्मि चक्रादिकं तद्वदित्यर्थः । A. C Mill. चक्रं रथस्य चक्रं रश्मि न यथा रश्मिः चक्रादिकं तद्वदित्यर्थः Ca. चक्रं रथस्य चक्रं रश्मिं चक्रादिकं तद्वदित्यर्थः B 4. pr. man. न रश्मि च inserted after रश्मिं sec. man. चक्रं रथस्य चक्रं रश्मिं न रश्मिचिव चक्रादिकं तद्वदित्यर्थः CB. (चक्रोदि° B 1.)

P. 267. l. 25. (X. 93, 12.) विस्तृताश्चरणीन्वर्धयति तद्वदित्यर्थः ॥ विस्तृताश्च रश्मीन् वर्धयति तद्वदित्यर्थः A. विस्तृताश्च रश्मीन् वर्धयति तद्वदित्यर्थः C Mill. विस्तृताश्च रश्मीन् वर्धयति तद्वदित्यर्थः Ca. विस्तृताश्च रश्मीन् वर्धयति तद्वदित्यर्थः B 4. विस्तृताश्च रश्मीन् वर्धयति तद्वदित्यर्थः B 1. CB. The text is corrupt.

P. 269. l. 2. (X. 93, 15.) युवनाश्वनामकस्य ॥ युश्वनामस्य A. युश्वनामस्य C Mill. युश्वनामस्य Ca. युश्वनामस्य B 4. pr. man. युवनाश्वनामकस्य B 4. sec. man. युवनाश्वनामकस्य CB. युवनाश्वनामकस्य B 1. The text is corrupt.

P. 271. l. 6. (X. 94, 5.) सोमं after सत् and न्यक् must be taken as an independent gloss.

P. 275. l. 18. (X. 95, init.) ऋषिका A. C Mill, Ca. B 4. pr. man. CB; deest in B 1. स ऋषिः B 4. sec. man.

P. 275. l. 24. (X. 95, init.) पुत्रैश्च Ca. B 4. sec. man. CB. पुत्रोश्च A. C Mill, B 4. pr. man. B 1.

P. 276. l. 11. (X. 95, init.) तत्पादन्यत् ॥ तत्पादन्यत् A. तत्पादन्यत् C Mill. तदात्यत् च Ca. B 4. sec. man. B 1. तदात्यत् च CB.

The passage in the Bṛihaddevatâ, though very corrupt, may be restored conjecturally, as follows :

पुरुवरसि राजर्षिपरास्तूर्वशी पुरा । न्यवत्सत्सर्विदं कृत्वा तस्मिन्मर्म चचार च ॥२०॥

तथा तस्य च संवासमसूयन्पाकशासनः । पैतामहं चानुरागमिन्द्रवचापि तस्य तु ॥२१॥<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This line is unintelligible. Paitāmaha may refer to Mitrāvaruṇau, grandfather of Purūravas, who fell in love with Urvaśî.

स तयोस्तु वियोगार्थं पार्श्वस्थं वज्रमवधीत् । प्रीतिं भिद्धि तयोर्विज्र मन चेदिच्छसि प्रियं ॥२२॥  
 तथेत्युक्त्वा तयोः प्रीतिं वज्रोऽभिनन्दन्मायया । ततस्तया विहीनस्तु चचारोन्मत्तवृषः ॥२३॥  
 चरन्सरसि सोऽपश्यदातिरूपाभिवोवैशीं । सखीभिरातिरूपाभिः पंचभिः पार्श्वतो वृतां ॥२४॥  
 पुनराह्वयतः प्रीत्या दुःखात्ता त्वन्नवोवृषं । अप्राप्याहं त्वयाद्येह स्वर्गे प्राप्स्यसि मां पुनः ॥२५॥  
 आह्वानं प्रति चाख्यातमितरेतरयोरीदं । संवादं नन्यते यास्तु इतिहासं तु शौनकः ॥२६॥

P. 276. l. 16. (X. 95, init.) उत्थाय जित्वा तौ मा गच्छेत्त्वेवं जल्पकोऽन्यतः ॥

उत्थाय जित्वा ता वा गच्छेत्त्वेवं जल्पकोऽन्यतः A.

उद्धाय जित्वा ता वा गच्छेत्त्वेवं जल्पकोऽन्यतः C Mill.

उय जित्वा त वो गच्छेत्त्वेवं जल्पको नृपा Ca.

उथाय जित्वा तावा गच्छेत्त्वेवं जल्पवतीत्यर्थं B 4. sec. man.

उथावा जित्वा गच्छेत्त्वेवं जकोऽन्यतः B 1.

उत्थाय जित्वा वा गच्छेत्त्वेवं जकोऽन्यतः CB.

उत्थाय जित्वा वा गच्छेत्त्वेवं जल्पति कोऽन्यतः Shadguruśishya.

If the correction is right, it would mean, "he, the king, having risen and having captured the two rams, shouting from the other side of the room, Do not come near! was shown, etc."

P. 276. l. 23. (X. 95, init.) साश्वं सापश्यदु° A. साश्वं सापश्यदु° C Mill. स सा पश्य Ca. साश्वं सापश्यदु° B 4. साश्वः सा पशुदु° CB. B 1.

P. 276. l. 24. (X. 95, init.) एषोऽप्यसूचयत् scil. इतिहासः.

P. 276. l. 26. (X. 95, init.) In the extract from the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa XI. 5, Professor Weber's edition has योग् instead of ज्योग्.

P. 279. l. 21. (X. 95, 5.) परमप्येवं मंतव्यं किमिति कातरो ॥ परमप्युप रतव्यं किमिति कातरो A. C Mill. परमप्येवं मंतव्यं किमिति कातरो Ca. CB. परामप्यापरः किमिति कामुक तरो B 4. sec. man. परमप्यरं किमिति कामकातरो B 1.

P. 280. l. 8. (X. 95, 6.) आश्वरार्थं Ca. आश्वरार्थं A. C Mill, B 4. CB. B 1.

P. 281. l. 14. (X. 95, 9.) Read मर्ते.

P. 281. l. 18. (X. 95, 9.) जिह्वाभिरात्मीयाः सृक्का भक्षयंतः ॥ जिह्वाभिरात्मीयाभिः सृक्का भक्षयंतः A. जिह्वाभिरात्मीयाः सृक्का भक्षयंतः C Mill, B 4. (सृक्काः B 4. sec. man. B 1.) जिह्वाभिरात्मीयस्य भक्षयंतः Ca. CB. I cannot guess the original reading.

P. 284. l. 7. (X. 95, 14.) Read आरण्याः.

P. 286. l. 1. (X. 95, 18.) All the MSS. read यज्ञसि; in B 4. only it is altered sec. man. to यज्ञाति.

P. 288. l. 1. (X. 96, 4.) हवीतः स्पृहणीयः CB. हवीतः स्पृहीणायः A. C Mill. हरितः स्पृहणीयः B 4. दर्शतः दर्शनीयः Ca.; deest in B 1.

P. 288. l. 2. (X. 96, 4.) अध्वाहन्तरो वा CB. It is difficult to say what Sāyaṇa wrote. B 1. writes simply आहन्तरो वा, but all the other MSS. show that there was originally another derivation given. A. reads अज्ञाध्वाहन्तरो वा. C Mill intended to give the same, but the writing is indistinct. Ca. could not make out the text,



and has the corrupt reading, असाधा वर्तते वा. B 4. strikes out whatever preceded हनारो and puts in आ, like B 1. I have given the reading of CB. as the most difficult, and therefore the most likely to cause misunderstanding, but I am not certain whether adhāvāhartri is quite correct, and whether asādhvāhartri may not have been Sāyana's explanation.

P. 290. l. 8. (X. 96, 9.) पुरतः प्रत्नस्य सोमस्य प्रीत्या चलतः ॥ पुरतः प्रत्नस्य सोमस्य प्रियवलजः B 4. CB. B 1. पुरतः प्रत्नस्य सोमस्य प्रिया चलतः C Mill; deest in A. पुरतः प्रकुष्य सोमस्य प्रिया चलतः Ca.

P. 290. l. 19. (X. 96, 10.) हे इन्द्र त्वां. These words seem to have been added afterwards, with reference to दधिषे.

P. 294. l. 17. (X. 97, 5.) भोजयिष्य A. भाजयिष्य Ca. C Mill, B 4. B 1. CB. Vāj. Samh. XII. 79, सेवध्वं!

P. 294. l. 19. (X. 97, 5.) विकरणा ॥ Should it be द्विविकरणा?

P. 305. l. 10. (X. 98, 11.) कुरुकुलजातमपि ॥ भूताकुलजालमपि A. C Mill, CB. भूताकुलजातमपि Ca. भूताकुलजालमपि B 4. भूताकुलजात्समपि B 1. उलकुलजातमपि?

P. 306. l. 20. (X. 99, 2.) मायासुरो ॥ Sāyana must have read माया instead of मायाः, for though some MSS. read आसुरोः, which is of little use, they have संभवति.

P. 307. l. 3. (X. 99, 3.) संग्रामे deest.

P. 314. l. 15. (X. 100, 7.) रूपस्य प्राप्ति मां किः मा भूत इतः परं मानुषं रूपं मा भूदित्यर्थः A.

रूपस्य प्राप्ति मां किः मा भूत इतः परं मा उपं रूपं मा भूदित्यर्थः C Mill.

रूपस्य प्राप्तिर्मां किः मा भूत इतः परं मानुषं रूपं मा भूदित्यर्थः B 1.

रूपस्य प्राप्ति कर्मा कर्मा भूत इतः परं मानुषं रूपं मा भूदित्यर्थः CB.

रूपस्य प्राप्तिर्मां किः मा भूत इतः परं मानुषं रूपं मा भूदित्यर्थः B 4.

रूपस्य प्राप्ति मा किं मा भूत इतः परं मानुषं रूपं मा भूदित्यर्थः Ca.

I have restored the text according to the MSS., but the reading seems to be corrupt in all of them.

P. 320. l. 22. (X. 101, 10.) दल्यध्वं. This would seem, according to the dictionaries, to be the very opposite of सीव्यध्वं, but the MSS. give no various reading.

P. 322. l. 5. (X. 101, 11.) Sāyana seems to have read बह्वी. Ca. only has प्र बह्वि, but for the rest agrees with the other MSS.

P. 322. ll. 12 and 18. (X. 101, 11.) शब्दमानो MSS.

P. 322. l. 13. (X. 101, 11.) द्विजानिद्विजायः । तयोरेतश्चरति ॥ द्विजातिः विज्ञानं तेषामतश्चरति A. C Mill. द्विजानि विज्ञानं तेषामतश्चरति B 1. द्विजानि द्विजानं तेषामतश्चरति CB. द्विजातिः द्विजाये तेषामतश्चरति Ca. द्विजानिः विज्ञानं तेषामतश्चरति B 4.

P. 322. l. 16. (X. 101, 11.) तासंघां ॥ त । संघां A. त संघा C Mill. ता स चं CB. त सघां B 1. ता संघां Ca. त स घां B 4.

P. 323. l. 2. (X. 101, 12.) उद्घातन is not explained by Sāyana.

P. 323. l. 5. (X. 101, 12.) ग्रीरदितिः A. C Mill, Ca. B 4. CB. ग्रीरदितिः B 1. ग्रीरदितिः ?

P. 335. l. 1. (X. 103, 12.) परेहि is left unexplained. On Apvā, see Weber, Indische Studien, IX. p. 482.

At the end of hymn 103 (VIII. 5, 23, nānuvākānte) the following Khila occurs :

असौ या सेनां मरुतः परेषामभ्यैति न ओजसा स्पर्धमाना ।  
तां गूहत् तमसार्पत्रेन यथाभीषामभ्यो अभ्यं न जानात् ॥१॥  
अंधा अभितो भवता शीर्षाया अहं इव ।  
तेषां वो अग्निदग्धानामग्निमूर्च्छानामिद्रौ हंतु वरंवरं ॥२॥

Cf. Atharva-veda III. 2, 6.

P. 339. l. 21. (X. 104, 9.) हत्यायां चकर्थं करोषि ॥ हत्यायमे ह वेमेव करोषि A. हत्यायमे हवमेव करोषि C Mill. हत्यायां मे हवं चकर्थं करोषि Ca. हत्याय -- चकर्थं करोषि B 4. हत्याय चकर्थं करोषि B 1. हत्याय मे हे वम चकर्थं करोषि CB.

P. 341. l. 11. (X. 105, 1.) वातेनाप्यते A. तेनाप्यते अप्यते C Mill. वातेनाप्यायते Ca. तेनाप्यते B 4. वात B 1.

P. 345. l. 14. (X. 105, 11.) कामितवानित्यर्थः A. C Mill, CB. B 4. pr. man. कानितवानित्यर्थः Ca. कामितवानित्यर्थः B 4. sec. man.

P. 349. l. 18. (X. 106, 5.) The derivation of शिंव may be referred to Uṇādi-sūtras IV. 95 and 96. Devarāja mentions निंवविंवशिंवहिंवडिंवस्वंस्वादय इति शिनोतेर्विप्रत्ययो सु मेति निपात्यते, and he adds अततेर्धम् । दुःखानि तनूकुर्वन्प्राप्यते. I had to change हेतुनातं into हेतुनातितं, taking अतित as a causal participle.

P. 349. l. 19. (X. 106, 5.) आलादेशः A. C Mill. आजादेशः Ca. B 4. sec. man. CB; deest in B 1. Sāyana frequently uses this आजादेशः, although the ordinary explanation of Pāṇ. VII. 1, 39, gives no authority for it.

P. 349. l. 26. (X. 106, 5.) Devarāja quotes, as coming from Mādhava, a sentence which is not in our commentary, although it expresses the meaning of Sāyana. After explaining शिंवाता, शतरा, and शतपंता as सुखनामानि, he says सुखवाचिनः सर्वे सुखकारयि (i. e. सुखकरेऽपि) स्युरिति माधवः । कालत्रयेऽप्यश्विनोः सुखस्य विवक्षितत्वेन विशेषभेदादपुनरुक्तिः । He then quotes Bhaṭṭabhaṅkara: भट्टभास्करमिश्रस्तु शिंवाता सुखनामैतत् । सुखौ । शतरा । शंततरो सुखतरौ । शतपंता ॥ शंतमौ । उभयत्रापि वर्धविकारादेः (रादि) पृषोदरादित्वात् । Instead of सुखस्य विवक्षितत्वेन (Ca.), even C Mill has सुखकरत्वम्, B 4. sec. man. सुखकरत्वमस्मद्विवक्षितत्वेन, A. सुखकरत्वमस्म विवक्षितत्वे, B 1. अश्विनोः सुखकरत्वमस्मद्विवक्षितत्वेन, CB. अश्विनोः सुखकरत्वमस्म विवक्षितं ते ।

P. 353. l. 6. (X. 106, 9.) The reading of the Uṇādi-sūtra IV. 207. is supported by all the MSS. The reading in Aufrecht's edition, ह्रस्वसुट् च, must be wrong. There is no such word as aptas, while apnas is a common Vedic word, and ought to be explained in the Sūtras. The Sūtra is rightly given in Boehtlingk's edition, yet in Boehtlingk's Dictionary we find aptas, and the same word is repeated by others. The Calcutta edition of the Uṇādi-sūtras repeats ह्रस्वसुट् च, but Tārānātha rightly omits the word in his great Dictionary.

P. 354. l. 7. (X. 106, 11.) गोष्वंतगोरूपस्यव° ॥ गोष्टतः गोरूपस्यव° A. गोष्टतः गोरूपं स्यव° C Mill. गोष्वंतः गोरूपस्यंत° CB. गोष्टतरयं धनं वोचतः खव° Ca. गोष्वंतः गोरूपस्यांत° B 4. sec. man. गोष्वंतः गोरूपस्यांत° B 1.

P. 354. l. 12. (X. 106, 11.) दिङ्मात्रं means within a short compass, alpa-mâtre; cf. Târânâtha, Śabdastomamahânidhi, s. v.

P. 356. l. 4. (X. 107, 3.) एतेभ्यो न भवति ॥ एते न त्रयंति A. एते न भवन्ति C Mill, Ca. B 4. B 1. CB.

P. 362. l. 5. (X. 108, 3.) The commentary is very imperfect in all the MSS. वहूनां is fem., like एकस्याः. Vrittāvrittibhyâm refers to गवां गोपतिः.

P. 365. l. 16. (X. 108, 10.) Before स the MSS. add अन्तान्, possibly meant for पत्नीन्.

P. 366. l. 26. (X. 109, 1.) This refers to the Prâtisākhya, Sūtra 139.

P. 368. l. 20. (X. 109, 4.) Instead of पतिवत्नी B 1. CB, we have सुकृतवती in A. Ca. B 4. C Mill.

P. 369. l. 3. (X. 109, 5.) बृहस्पतिनामलभतेति ॥ एवं खं पतिः मालमलभतेति A. एवं खं पतिः मामलभतेति C Mill, B 4. एवं खपतिं बृहस्पतिनामलभतेति Ca. एवं खपतिं मामलेति B 1. CB.

P. 369. l. 11. (X. 109, 5.) जुहोतेद्वे च must be a vārttika to Pāṇ. III. 2, 178. We find its elements in the vārt. द्युतिगमिनुहोतीनां द्वे च and in जुहोतेदीर्घश्च. See also Unādisūtra II. 61.

P. 376. l. 4. (X. 111, 1.) The poet is called the first time अष्टादंष्ट्र in A. C Mill, CB. B 4, अष्टादंष्ट्र in B 1, दिष्ट्र in Ca. The second time, अष्टादंष्ट्र in A. C Mill, CB. B 4. Ca. B 1; yet the right form is अष्टादंष्ट्र. Aufrecht and the Petersburg Dictionary give the wrong form, अष्टादंष्ट्र.

P. 377. l. 15. (X. 111, 3.) The end of the commentary is left out in all the MSS.

P. 387. l. 7. (X. 113, 3.) भवति A. C Mill, Ca. B 1. CB. B 4.

P. 393. l. 3. (X. 114, 4.) Ca. reads यद्वा समुदजं सर्वतो गतो गमनं तच्छीलं प्रपञ्चजातमाविष्टवान् सृष्ट्वा तदेवान् प्राविशदिति श्रुतेः । वायुपक्षे बाह्यादिरूपेण विवेश सः इदं विश्वं. This looks more like part of the original commentary than a marginal note, though it is left out in all the other MSS. यद्वा समदंनं पायुरुपेण विवेश A. यद्वा समदंनं वायुरुपेण विवेश C Mill, B 4. यद्वा समुद्रं न वायुरुपेण विवेश B 1. What is intended in Ca. is evidently a distinction between the Paramâtma and the mere Vāyu, frequently discussed by the Vedānta philosophers: cf. Ved. Sūtra II. 3, 1. seq. For that purpose समुद्रं was explained as समुद्रं सर्वतो गमनं । तच्छीलं प्रपञ्चजातमाविष्टवान् । बाह्यादि might seem better than वायुरुपेण or वायुदिरूपेण, because the Paramâtma is never bāhya, the bāhya world beginning with ākāśa, which itself is still vibhu: ākāśādisarva-prapañcha etc. See Ved. Sūtra II. 3, 7: एतेन मातरिष्वा व्याख्यातः । एतेनाकाशोत्पत्तिप्रतिपादनेन वायोरुत्पत्तिरपि प्रतिपादिता भवतीत्यर्थः । आकाशाद्वायुरिति श्रुतेः । But in that case we should expect बाह्य, and not बाह्यादि.

P. 394. l. 1. (X. 114, 6.) The number of Grahas given by Sāyaṇa is 33, not 36. Other Grahas may be seen in Vāj. Saṃhitā VII and VIII.

P. 395. l. 4. (X. 114, 8.) Here again Ca. has its own independent reading, तदाधारत्वेन विषयानां तद्वापदेशः आकाशादागतानि पृथिव्यग्नेजोवायुकाशरूपाणि etc.

P. 396. l. 27. (X. 115, 1.) समासांतस्यानङः स्त्रियामिष्टत्वाद° ॥ समासांतस्य । डः न यामिष्टत्वाद° A.

समासांतस्य डः न यामिष्टत्वाद् C Mill. समासांत - नि ड स्त्रियामिष्टत्वाद् Ca. समासांतस्याडः स्त्रियामिष्टत्वाद् B 4. sec. man. समासांतस्यङ् न यामिष्टत्वाद् CB. समासांतस्य ङ् न यामिष्टत्वाद् B 1.

P. 397. l. 15. (X. 115, 2.) हेतौ A. C Mill, Ca. B 4. B 1. CB. Cf. Pân. III. 2, 126.

P. 400. l. 13. (X. 115, 7.) It is clear that Sâyana read वसु हवे, as he could not otherwise have quoted Pân. VIII. 3, 106. The Pada MSS. read वसुः सत्वे, but the Samhitâ MSS. वसुं हवे, which, however, may represent both वसुः सत्वे and वसु सत्वे ।. Though I have always given the Visarga, even where the MSS. omit it before स etc., yet in this passage I felt obliged to make an exception. Cf. Pân. VIII. 3, 36, 1.

P. 400. l. 17. (X. 115, 7.) The words from द्योतमाना to जनान् are given by Ca. only.

P. 401. l. 19. (X. 116, 1.) Shadguruśishya gives Sthaura, the son of Sthûra; Colebrooke's MS. of the Anukramanî gives Sthauva; Sâyana, Sthaula in A. C Mill, CB. B 1. B 4; but Sthaura in Ca.

P. 405. l. 10. (X. 116, 7.) After सुतः the MSS. add दु पि वेद्यत्वाद्युदात्तत्वं A. दुपि वेद्यत्वाद्युदात्तत्वं C Mill. सुवेत्ताद्युदात्तत्वं Ca. दुः पि वेत्ताद्युदात्तत्वं B 4. दुः पि वे श्रु त्वाद्युदात्तत्वं CB. दुः पि वेद्यत्वाद्युदात्तत्वं B 1.

P. 408. l. 12. (X. 117, 4.) व्यतिरेकेण निंदा माह ॥ व्यतिरेकेन निंदा माह Ca. व्यतिरेकान्वयाभ्यामाह A. C Mill, CB. B 4. पति° B 1. Cf. verses 1 and 3.

P. 418. l. 12. (X. 119, 11.) अकार्षे ॥ अकार्षे MSS.

P. 423. l. 20. (X. 120, 6.) क्सेयः instead of केय in the Upâdi-sûtras III. 99, if indeed the reading there, as explained by the commentary, is correct.

P. 428. l. 24. (X. 121, 4.) प्राच्यारंभा आग्नेय्याद्याः कोणदिश ईशानांता वा ॥ प्रारंभाः अग्नेय्याद्याः कोणदिशः ईशितव्याः A. C Mill; Ca. leaves out all except दीशतव्याः. प्रारंभा आग्नेय्याद्याः कोणदिशः ईशितव्याः B 4. प्रारंभा आग्नेय्याद्याः कोणदेशे ईशतव्याः B 1.

P. 430. l. 9. (X. 121, 7.) Ca. only gives the following independent explanation, धारयन्तः आपो ह अपो ह आप एक व विश्वमायन् सर्वे जगदापूरयन् यत् यस्मात्तत् तस्माद्धेतोः देवानां देवादीनां सर्वेषां प्राणिनां असु प्राणभूतः एकः प्रजापतिः समवर्तत समजायत । यद्वा । यत् यं गर्भे दधानाः आपो. Though it rests on the authority of Ca. only, I have adopted it in the text, because it seems required by what comes before.

P. 438. l. 1. (X. 123, 2.) There is a lacuna between आकाशे or आकाशस्य and इमं वेन in all the MSS. In A. C Mill, B 4. the lacuna is mentioned in the text, पङ्क्तिरेका त्यक्तास्ति; in B 1. there are dots to indicate it; in CB. and Ca. the commentary goes on without any indications of an omission.

P. 452. l. 14. (X. 126, 4.) अनुकूले वेद्ये । CB. B 1. अनुकूलवेद्ये A. C Mill. अनुकूले वेद्ये B 4. pr. man. लवे° B 4. sec. man.

P. 456. l. 1. (X. 127, 4.) छांदसः शपो लुक्. See, however, the explanation in the next verse.

At the end of X. 127. (VIII. 7, 14) the following Khila occurs. It has been printed and discussed in Muir's Sanskrit Texts, vol. IV. p. 498. With the exception of the first two verses, I have not given the accents, as the MSS.

are quite untrustworthy. The text, too, is corrupt in several places. I give the text from S. 1. and S. 2:

आ रात्रिं पार्थिवं रजः पितुरप्रायि<sup>1</sup> धर्मभिः ।  
 दिवः सदांसि बृहती वि तिष्ठस आ त्वेषं वर्तते तमः ॥१॥<sup>2</sup>  
 य ते रात्रि<sup>3</sup> नृचक्षुसो युक्तासौ नवतिनैव ।  
 अशीतिः सैत्यष्टा<sup>4</sup> उतो ते सप्त सप्ततिः<sup>5</sup> ॥२॥<sup>6</sup>  
 रात्रौ प्र पद्ये जननीं<sup>7</sup> सर्वभूतनिवेशनीं ।  
 भद्रां भगवतीं कृष्णां विश्वस्य जगतो निशां<sup>8</sup> ॥३॥  
 संवेशनीं संयमनीं ग्रहनखतमालिनीं<sup>9</sup> ।  
 प्रपन्नोऽहं शिवां रात्रौ भद्रे पारमशीमहि भद्रे पारमशीमह्यो नमः ॥४॥  
 स्तोष्यामि प्रयतो देवीं शरण्यां बहुचप्रियां ।  
 सहस्रसंमितां दुर्गां ज्ञातवेदसे सुनवाम सोमं ॥५॥<sup>10</sup>  
 शांत्यर्थे तद्विजातीनामृषिभिः सोमपाश्रिताः<sup>11</sup> ।  
 च्युवेदे त्वं समुत्पन्ना रात्रीयतो नि दहाति वेदः ॥६॥  
 ये त्वां देवि प्रपद्यन्ति<sup>12</sup> ब्राह्मणा हव्यवाहनीं ।  
 अविद्या बहुविद्या वा सा नः पर्यदति दुर्गाणि विश्वा ॥७॥  
 अग्निवर्णी<sup>13</sup> शुभां सौम्यां कौर्तेपिष्यन्ति ये द्विजाः ।  
 तां तारयति<sup>14</sup> दुर्गाणि नावेव सिंधुं दुरितात्पग्निः ॥८॥<sup>15</sup>  
 दुर्गेषु विषमे घोरं संग्रामे रिपुसंकटे ।  
 अग्निचोरनिपातेषु सर्वग्रहनिवारिणि<sup>16</sup> सर्वग्रहनिवारिण्यो<sup>17</sup> नमः ॥९॥  
 दुर्गेषु विषमेषु त्वं<sup>18</sup> संग्रामेषु वनेषु च ।  
 मोहयित्वा प्र पद्यते तेषां मे अभयं कृणु तेषां मे अभयं कृणु ॥१०॥<sup>19</sup>  
 केशिनीं सर्वभूतानां पंचमीति च नाम च ।  
 सा मां समा निशा देवी सर्वतः परि रक्षतु सर्वतः परि रक्षत्वो नमः ॥११॥  
 तामग्निवर्णीं तपसा ज्वलन्तीं वैरोचनीं कर्मफलेषु जुष्टां ।  
 दुर्गां देवीं शरणमहं प्र पद्ये सुतरसि तरसे<sup>20</sup> नमः सुतरसि तरसे नमः ॥१२॥  
 दुर्गां दुर्गेषु स्थानेषु शं नो देवीरभिष्टये ।  
 य इमं दुर्गास्तवं<sup>21</sup> पुण्यं रात्रीमूक्तं जपेत्सदा<sup>22</sup> ॥१३॥  
 रात्री कुशिकः सौभरो रात्रिर्वा भारद्वाजी रात्रिस्तवं गायत्वं<sup>23</sup> ।  
 रात्रीमूक्तं जपेन्नित्यं तत्काल उप पद्यते<sup>24</sup> ॥१४॥

<sup>1</sup> पितुरः प्रायि S. 1. पितुरप्रायु S. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Vāj. Samh. XXXIV. 32. Nir. IX. 29. Atharva-veda

XIX. 47. 1.

<sup>3</sup> रात्री S. 1. 2.

<sup>4</sup> संत्यष्टा S. 1. 2.

<sup>5</sup> सप्तति S. 1. सप्ततीः S. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Atharva-veda

XIX. 47. 3.

<sup>7</sup> जननी S. 1.

<sup>8</sup> दिशां S. 1.

<sup>9</sup> गृह<sup>o</sup> S. 1. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Verses 5-8 wanting in S. 1.

<sup>11</sup> समुपाश्रिताः M.

<sup>12</sup> °द्यते?

<sup>13</sup> ये अग्नि<sup>o</sup> S. 2.

<sup>14</sup> तांस्ता<sup>o</sup>?

<sup>15</sup> In MS. W. 445. portions

of a Durgāstava are here inserted.

<sup>16</sup> दुष्टग्रहनिवारणे S. 2.

<sup>17</sup> °वरणे?

<sup>18</sup> °रण्यो S. 1.

<sup>19</sup> त्वां?

<sup>19</sup> Verses 10 and 11 wanting in S. 1.

<sup>20</sup> °रेसे S. 2.

<sup>21</sup> °च S. 1.

<sup>22</sup> रात्रौ रात्रौ सदा पठेत् S. 2.

<sup>23</sup> रात्रि कुशिकं सौभरो रात्रिर्वा भारद्वाजी रात्रिस्तवं गायत्वं S. 1. रात्रिः कुशिकसौभरो रात्रिस्तवो गायत्री S. 2. I have corrected this line, because it is clearly an extract from the Anukramanī.

<sup>24</sup> पद्ये S. 1. तत्कालमुप पद्यते S. 2.

Some MSS., S. 2. and my own *Parīśiṣṭa* collection, add here the *Khila*, which other MSS. give after hymn 142.

After hymn 128 (*Aṣṭ.* VIII. 7, 16) the following *Khila* occurs. The accents are given from S. 2:

अ॒वौच॑मि॒द्रम॑मु॒तो ह॑वामहे॒ यो गो॑जि॒द्धंजि॑दंश्च॒जिद्यः॑ ।  
 इ॒मं नो॑ य॒ज्ञं वि॒ह्वे जु॑म॒स्यास्य॑ कु॒र्मो हरि॑वो मे॒दिनं॑ त्वा ॥१॥<sup>1</sup>  
 आ॒युष्यै॑ व॒चस्यै॑ रा॒यस्यो॑षमौ॒द्भिदं॑ ।<sup>2</sup>  
 इ॒दं हि॑र॒ण्यं व॑च॒सश्चै॒त्राया॑ वि॒शता॑तु मां<sup>3</sup> ॥२॥<sup>4</sup>  
 उ॒च्चैर्वी॑जि पु॒तना॑पाट॒सभा॑सा॒ धनं॑ज॒यं ।  
 सवैः॑ स॒मग्रा॑ च॒न्द्रयो॑ हि॒रण्ये॑<sup>5</sup> स्मि॒न्समा॑हि॒ताः ॥३॥  
 शु॒नम॑हं हि॒रण्यस्य॑<sup>5</sup> पि॒तुर्ना॑मे॒व<sup>6</sup> ज॒ग्रभं॑ ।  
 तेन॑ मां सूर्यै॒त्वच॑म॒करं॑ पू॒रुषु॑ प्रि॒यं ॥४॥  
 स॒धार्जं॑ च वि॒राजं॑ चाभि॒ष्टिया॑ च॒ मे भु॑वा ।  
 ल॒क्ष्मी रा॑ष्ट्रस्य या मु॒खे तया॑ मा॒मिदं॑ सं सु॒ज ॥५॥  
 अ॒ग्नेः प्र॑जा॒तं परि॑ यद्वि॒रण्यम॑मु॒तं ज॒ज्ञे अ॒धि म॑र्त्येषु ।<sup>7</sup>  
 य इ॒नद्वे॑द स इ॒देन॑महे॒ति<sup>8</sup> ज॒रामु॑त्सु॒र्भवति॑ यो वि॒भर्ति॑ ॥६॥  
 यद्वे॒द राजा॑ वरु॒णो यदु॑ दे॒वी सर॑स्वती ।<sup>9</sup>  
 इ॒न्द्रो यद्वृ॑त्र॒हा वे॒द तन्मे॑ व॒चस॑ आ॒युषे॑<sup>10</sup> ॥७॥  
 न तद्वृ॒क्षांसि॑ न पि॒शाचा॑श्चर॒न्ति दे॒वाना॑मो॒जः प्र॑यम॒जं ह्ये॒तत् ॥<sup>11</sup>  
 यो वि॒भर्ति॑ दा॒क्षाय॑णाहि॒रण्यं॑ स दे॒वेषु॑ कृ॒णुते॑ दी॒र्घिमा॑युः स म॒नुष्ये॑षु कृ॒णुते॑ दी॒र्घिमा॑युः ॥८॥<sup>12</sup>  
 यदा॒वभ॑न्दा॒क्षाय॑णाहि॒रण्यं॑ श॒तानी॑का॒य सु॑मन्स्य॒मानाः ॥<sup>13</sup>  
 तन्न<sup>14</sup> आ॒ च॒भ्रामि॑ श॒तशरि॑दा॒यायु॑ष्मा॒न्नर॑दं॒ष्टिर्घोषा॑सत्<sup>15</sup> ॥९॥  
 घृ॒तादु॑त्सु॒र्भं<sup>16</sup> म॒धुम॑त्सु॒वर्णं॑ धनं॒जयं॑ ध॒रुणं॑ धारि॒ष्यु ॥<sup>17</sup>  
 च॒ण्वक्स॑प॒त्ना<sup>18</sup>दि॒धरां॑श्च कृ॒ण्वदा॑ रो॒ह मां॑ म॒हते॑ सौ॒भगा॑य ॥१०॥  
 प्रि॒यं मां॑ कुरु॒ देवेषु॑ प्रि॒यं राज॑सु मा कुरु ।<sup>19</sup>  
 प्रि॒यं वि॒श्वेषु॑ गो॒त्रेषु॑<sup>20</sup> म॒रि॒यं धेहि॑ रु॒चा रु॒चं<sup>21</sup> ॥११॥  
 अ॒ग्नि॒र्येन॑ वि॒राज॑ति॒ सूर्यो॑ येन॒ वि॒राज॑ति ।<sup>22</sup>  
 वि॒राज्ये॑न॒ वि॒राज॑ति॒ तेना॑स्मान्ना॒न्न॒न्नस्य॑ते॒ वि॒राज॑ स॒मिधं॑ कुरु ॥१२॥

<sup>1</sup> Tait. Samh. IV. 7, 14, 4. Tait. Br. I. 4, 3, 2. Atharva-veda V. 3, 11. <sup>2</sup> Cf. Āśvalāyanaśākhokta-mantra-saṃhitā (MS. Wa. 144), p. 133. <sup>3</sup> तादिमां? <sup>4</sup> Vāj. Samh. XXXIV. 50. <sup>5</sup> ऽण्यस्य S. 2.

<sup>6</sup> पितुर्मानेव S. 2. <sup>7</sup> Atharva-veda XIX. 26, 1. <sup>8</sup> नजहं S. 1. नदहं? स इवेदम? <sup>9</sup> Atharva-veda V. 25, 6; XIX. 26, 4. <sup>10</sup> युषा S. 1. <sup>11</sup> Vāj. Samh. XXXIV. 51. <sup>12</sup> This is quoted as a *Khailiko* mantra by Devarāja in his *Naighaṇṭukabhāṣya*, p. 8<sup>a</sup>. He reads दा॒क्षाय॑णं, which is also the reading of other MSS.

<sup>13</sup> Vāj. Samh. XXXIV. 5, 2. Atharva-veda I. 35, 1. <sup>14</sup> तन्न S. 1. <sup>15</sup> सन् S. 1. <sup>16</sup> स॒ं Atharva-veda. <sup>17</sup> घृ॒तादु॑त्सु॒र्भं S. 1. <sup>18</sup> घृ॒तादु॑त्सु॒र्भं S. 2. <sup>19</sup> Atharva-veda V. 28, 4. <sup>20</sup> त्वान् Atharva-veda. <sup>21</sup> Atharva-veda XIX. 62, 1. <sup>22</sup> गो॒त्रेषु॑ S. 1. 2. <sup>23</sup> रु॒चा रु॒चा S. 1. <sup>24</sup> Instead of this verse, S. 1. repeats verse 1.

P. 462. l. 26. (X. 129, 1.) सृष्टिस्थितिप्रलयादीनां ॥ सृष्टिस्थित्यादिप्रलयादीनां A. C Mill, Ca. सृष्टिस्थित्यादिः प्रलयादीनां B 1. CB. सृष्टिस्थित्यादि प्रलयादीनां B 4. सृष्टिस्थित्यादि may have been originally an explanation of प्रलयादिदीनां.

P. 463. l. 26. (X. 129, 1.) चाक्षेपमुखेन ॥ चाक्षेपमुखेन Ca. चापेक्षामुखेन A. C Mill. चापेक्षामुखेन B 4. B 1. CB. Both चाक्षेपमुखेन, by way of objection or irony, and चापेक्षामुखेन, by way of disdain or dissent, would be applicable. I see this is confirmed by Sāyana's commentary on the Taittiriya-brāhmaṇa II. 8, 9, 3.

P. 465. l. 21. (X. 129, 2.) प्रकृतिप्रत्ययान्तां. I can only explain this as referring to the prakṛiti of svadhā which was given before, and to the pratyaya, the instrumental, as implying both union with and dependence on the real sat.

P. 466. l. 22. (X. 129, 3.) तद्रूपता तदात्मनां ॥ तद्रूपतां तदात्मतां A. B 4. Ca. B 1. तद्रूपतां तदात्मनां C Mill. तद्रूपतां तदात्मनां CB. I do not see how this sentence comes in here.

P. 470. l. 11. (X. 129, 7.) प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् ॥ प्रकृति ज्ञा दृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् A. C Mill. प्रकृतज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् Ca. तिष्ठप्र in marg. प्रकृतिश्च प्रज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् B 1. B 4. प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् CB. See on the whole subject the commentary to this Sūtra.

P. 471. l. 20. (X. 130, 1.) The passage from शतसंख्या to पालका is preserved in CB. only, which MS., on the contrary, has its own lacuna afterwards. For after विस्तारवान् it adds यदुक्तः सर्गालोको यज्ञः चं सर्वं जगत् सर्वजनेन व्यापुः, while the other MSS. give all from पालकाः to व्यापुः. I have added पितरः conjecturally, as the word explained by पालकाः. The passage has suffered much.

P. 471. l. 25. (X. 130, 1.) Instead of स्ववपनेन we read सर्वजनेन A. C Mill, Ca. CB. B 1. सर्वजने B 4. न in marg. स्वसर्जनेन? Though the passage in CB. is far from correct, I have given it as indicating at least how the words of the text were taken by Sāyana.

P. 472. l. 24. (X. 130, 2.) B 1. CB. B 4. pr. man. add after अनुवादी, नाके अस्मिन्निति शोधं कृतव्याख्यानं वा.

P. 474. l. 4. (X. 130, 4.) दापं चापि A. C Mill. चापं चैव Ca. B 1. B 4. दापं चापि CB. Cf. Pāṇ. IV. 1, 4, and Gaṇa ajādi.

P. 478. l. 25. (X. 130, 5.) आज्ञादध्यादि A. C Mill, CB. B 1. B 4. ओषध्यादि° Ca.

P. 482. l. 17. (X. 132, 5.) From अस्मिन्नुपौ to इति गतेः प्रकृतिस्वरत्वं all is left out in A. C Mill, B 4. B 1. CB.

P. 482. l. 21. (X. 132, 5.) मित्रो वरुणो वा ॥ मित्रावरुणो वा A. C Mill. मित्रावरुणौ वा Ca. मित्रावरुणो B 1. CB. मित्रावरुणौ B 4. marg. वा.

P. 483. l. 26. (X. 132, 7.) Again from वनर्षदं to उभयत्र all is left out in A. C Mill, B 4. B 1. CB.

P. 490. l. 24. (X. 134, 5.) वियता. The explanation is unusual, but not sufficiently so to require conjectural emendation. वियता A. Ca. C Mill, B 1. B 4. CB.

P. 493. l. 20. (X. 135, 3.) From पुण्यापुण्यात्मके to शरीरात्मके Ca. only gives the text,

viz. पुण्यं पुण्यकामात्मकं कामं क्रियते तेन व भोगप्रदानाय इदं शरीरमारभ्यत इति परंपरस्य मनसा शरीरस्य निष्पादकं तं शरीरात्मकं.

P. 499. l. 10. (X. 136, 7.) In explaining the षष्ठी, the reference to Pāṇ. II. 3, 62, is taken for granted.

P. 499. l. 13. (X. 136, 7.) आलोडयति; the MSS. have आलोक्षयति.

P. 499. l. 26. (X. 137, 1.) The first half of the commentary is imperfect in all the MSS.

P. 505. l. 8. (X. 138, 5.) अग्रदूतसेनः ॥ प्रकृतसेनः A. C Mill. अहूतसेनः Ca.; deest in B 4. B 1. CB.

P. 509. l. 15. (X. 139, 6.) From जानाति to जानाति lacuna in all MSS. except Ca.

P. 509. l. 24. (X. 140, 1.) The quotation from the Âranyaka is here, as elsewhere, omitted. B 1. 4. give गतो विनियोगः 1.

P. 511. l. 5. (X. 140, 3.) इत्यस्य ॥ One might conjecture इत्यत्र.

P. 511. l. 12. (X. 140, 4.) Instead of जायमानैरात्मनैस्तेजोभिः A. C Mill, Ca., we find यजमानैरात्मनैः स्तोत्रभिः in B 1. 4. CB.

P. 517. l. 21. (X. 142, 6.) वाजा वेगा Ca. वाजाः खगाः A. C Mill, CB. खाडाः B 4. B 1. In the old writing वेगाः (त्वगाः) and खगाः are nearly the same.

P. 517. l. 26. (X. 142, 6.) अद्वा कर्तव्यः ॥ अद्वा कर्तव्यः A. अद्वा कर्तव्यः C Mill. अद्वा वर्तव्यः Ca. कर्तव्यः B 1. 4. वद्वा कर्तव्यः CB. Cf. Pāṇ. VII. 3, 78, where the change is made dependent on śit.

After hymn 142 (VIII. 8, 7) the following Khila occurs. The accents are marked in some of the MSS., but so carelessly that I left them out. Only S. 2. and two MSS. belonging to myself, M. m., give this hymn :

हिमस्य त्वा जरायुशग्ने परि व्ययामसि ।

उत हृदो<sup>1</sup> हि नो भुवोऽग्निर्ददातु भेषजं । शीतहृदो हि नो भुवोऽग्निर्ददातु भेषजं ॥२॥<sup>2</sup>

अंतिकामग्निमजनदुर्वैदः<sup>3</sup> शिशुरागमत्<sup>4</sup> ।

अजातपुत्रपक्षाया हृदयं मम धूयते<sup>5</sup> ॥३॥

विपुलं वनं<sup>6</sup> वद्वाकाशं चर जातवेदः कामाय ।

मां च<sup>7</sup> रक्ष पुत्रांश्च शरणमभूञ्जव ॥४॥

पिंगाक्ष लोहितग्रीव कृष्णवर्ण नमोऽस्तु ते ।

अस्मान्नि बर्हणस्योनां<sup>8</sup> सागरस्योर्नयो यया ॥५॥

इंद्रः<sup>9</sup> अत्वं ददातु वरुणमभि पिंचतु ।

शतवो निधनं यांतु जयस्व<sup>10</sup> ब्रह्मतेजसा ॥६॥

<sup>1</sup> हृदौ S. 2. <sup>2</sup> See Atharva-veda VI. 106, 3. Vāj. Samh. XVII. 5. Tait. Samh. IV. 6, 1, 1. <sup>3</sup> °जर

दूर्वा S. 2. °जनहू M. °जनयहू m. <sup>4</sup> शिशुला S. 2. <sup>5</sup> हूयते M. हूयते m. <sup>6</sup> विपुलवंतं M. <sup>7</sup> मां च M.

मांश्च S. 2. <sup>8</sup> अस्यां नि बर्है रस्योनां S. 2. अस्यान्नि बर्है स्योनां m. <sup>9</sup> इंद्रं S. 2. इंद्र M. m.

<sup>10</sup> जयस्वं S. 2. m..



कपिलजटीं सर्वभक्षं चाग्निं प्रत्यक्षदेवतं<sup>1</sup> ।

वरुणं च वशाम्यग्रे मम पुत्रांश्च रक्षतु मम पुत्रांश्च रक्षत्वो<sup>2</sup> नमेः ॥७॥

सायं वर्षशतं जीव पिब खाद च मोद च ।

दुःखितांश्च द्विजांश्चैव प्रजां च पशु<sup>3</sup> पालय ॥८॥

यावदादित्यस्तपति यावद्भ्राजति चंद्रमाः ।

यावद्वायुः प्रवायति<sup>4</sup> तावज्जीव जयाजय ॥९॥

येन केन प्रकारेण को वीनामनु<sup>5</sup> जीवति ।

परेषामुपकारार्थं यज्जीवति स जीवति । एतां वैश्वानरं<sup>6</sup> सर्वदेव<sup>7</sup> नमोऽस्तु ते ॥१०॥

One MS. adds: न चोरभयं न च सर्पभयं न च व्याघ्रभयं न च मृत्युभयं ।

यस्यापि मृत्युर्न च मृत्युः सर्वे लभते सर्वे जयते ॥

P. 522. l. 22. (X. 144. 1.) The poet's name is given as ऊर्ध्वकृशान by C Mill, A. (once), Ca., as ऊर्ध्वकृशान in CB. B 1. 4. Colebrooke's MS. of the Anukramanī has long *ā*, and so has Shadgurusishya (once). But as the text of the Rig-veda has the short *a*, the name must be spelt with short *a*.

P. 525. l. 14. (X. 144. 7.) After अभिषुतः at the end of the commentary, A. adds यद्वा अस्मत्तद्वदभिमुख्येन सुतः प्रेरितः ते तु रित्यन्वयः ।, C Mill यद्वा अस्मत् अस्मत्तद्वदभिमुख्येन सुतः प्रेरितः तेनद्विखेत्यन्वयः ।, Ca. यद्वा अस्मत् अस्मत्तद्वदभिमुख्येन सुतः प्रेरितः तेनद्विखेत्यन्वयः ।.

P. 525. l. 21. (X. 145. 1.) From यदि वारुण्यसि to आलिंगनमिति there is a lacuna in B 1. CB; B 4. adds on the margin the words from यदि वारुण्यसि to निष्क्रीणामीति.

P. 525. l. 21. (X. 145. 1.) After परिक्लृप्तः, B 1. CB. go on at once to तत्र प्रथमा. B 4. does the same, but adds in margin the words from यदि वारुण्यसि to निष्क्रीणामीति. I give the fragments from which I have tried to restore some kind of text, though, without the original of Āpastamba and without the aid of the B. class, it was impossible to restore the text in a satisfactory manner.

For the first portion of the extract we find some analogy in the Gobhila Gṛihya Sūtras II. 6, 6 seq. I retain परिक्लृप्तः, though Gobhila has परिक्रिय, and निष्क्रीणामि instead of Gobhila's परिक्रीणामि. In the Nītimañjari, however, we read वरुणाय त्वा परिक्रीणामि, and again सोमाय त्वा परिक्रीणामि. Then यवो भूत उन्नरया स्वाप्योन्नारामि-स्तिसृभिरभिमन्त्र्योन्नरया प्रतिष्ठन्ना हस्तयोरावध्य शयनकाले बाहुभ्यां भर्तारं परिगृह्णीयात् उपधानलिंगया वश्यो भवति सपत्नीवाधना वेति ।.

A. यदि वारुण्यसि वरुणास्त्वा निष्क्रीणामि यदि सौम्यसि सोमास्त्वा निष्क्रीणामि । श्वोभूत उन्नरयोः

C Mill The same as A, except नि । भूत उन्नरयोः-

Ca. The same as A, except नि । यवोभूत उन्नरयोः

A. उन्नरामिस्तिसृभिरभिमन्त्र्य उन्नरया प्रतिष्ठन्ना हस्तयोरावध्य शयनकाले बाहुभ्यां भर्तारं परिगृह्णीयात्

C Mill भिमन्त्र्य

Ca. स्वाप्यः उन्नरामिस्तिसृभिरभिमन्त्र्य योः आ शयनकाले

<sup>1</sup> दे० M.

<sup>2</sup> ऽत्तो S. 2. m.

<sup>3</sup> चाशु M.

<sup>4</sup> प्र वाजति m.

<sup>5</sup> वि० m.

<sup>6</sup> नरं S. 2. M.

<sup>7</sup> देवं M.

A. उपधानलिङ्गया वश्यो भवति सपत्नीवाधनं चेति । अयमर्थः । आद्यया पाठा नामोषधिः स्वात्प्या ।

C Mill

नाम षधिः

Ca.

वश्यो

नाम ओषधिः ।

A. ततस्त्रिसृभिरोषधेरभिमन्त्रणे षष्ठावद्धा सौषधिः यथा भस्त्रैरि स्पृशति तथा तस्य भर्तुरालिङ्गनमिति ।

C Mill

Ca.

ततस्त्रिसृ रोषधेर

वद्धा ओषधिः

Instead of ओभूते one expects यवैः क्रीतां.

P. 529. l. 18. (X. 146, 3.) अरख्ये छत्तं ॥ अरख्यौ । छत्तं A. C Mill. अपेक्षितं Ca.; deest in B 1. CB. अरख्ये छत्तं B 4. in marg. अपेक्षितं would be the easier reading; see also Taittiriya-brāhmaṇa II. 5, 5, (p. 624. ll. 13, 14.)

P. 529. l. 25. (X. 146, 4.) After आह्वयति the commentary is deficient in all MSS. except Ca.; but there, too, it is incorrect. Ca. gives निष्ठां गामन्विद्वन् त्वदीयं नमो अन्ते after आह्वयति; this I cannot restore. The commentary on the Taittiriya-brāhmaṇa II. 5, 5, is far better.

P. 534. l. 11. (X. 148, 3.) After स्याम, the MSS. insert समुद्रा A. C Mill, Ca. B 4. समुद्र B 1. स तु भः तमुद्र CB.

P. 535. l. 18. (X. 149, 1.) अर्चैतस्यार्चं A. C Mill.

अर्चैतस्यार्चं Ca.

deest in B 4. B 1. CB.

अर्चैतो A. C Mill, B 4. B 1. CB.

अर्चैतो Ca.

अर्चैतैरख्यस्तूपः MS. Coll. 132. अर्चिनो हैरख्यस्तूपः twice, Shadgurusishya, MS. E. I. H. 1823.

P. 536. l. 7. (X. 149, 1.) After शिखकं, साक्षी A. C Mill, B 4. in marg.; deest in Ca. B 1. CB. सारधिः ?

P. 537. l. 6. (X. 149, 3.) अतो हेतोः A. C Mill, Ca. अतो हेतुभूतौ B 1. CB. हेतुभूतः B 4. sec. man.

P. 539. l. 23. (X. 150, 4.) विशेषणसापेक्षस्यापि धनशब्दस्य समासश्छांदसः ॥ विशेषणस्यापि समासः A. विशेषणस्यापि समासः C Mill. विशेषण सापेक्षस्यापि नशब्दस्य छांदसः CB. B 1. adds समासः. विशेषण सापेक्षस्यापि समासः B 4. विशेषे विशेषेण सापेक्षस्यापि धनशब्दस्य छांदसः Ca.

After hymn 151 (VIII. 8, 11) the following Khila occurs :

मेधां मयमंगिरसो मेधां सप्त ऋच्यो ददुः<sup>1</sup> ।<sup>2</sup>

मेधामिन्द्रश्चाग्निश्च मेधां धाता ददातु<sup>3</sup> ते<sup>4</sup> ॥१॥<sup>5</sup>

मेधां मे<sup>6</sup> वरुणो राजा मेधां देवो सरस्वती ।

मेधां मे<sup>7</sup> अश्विनौ देवावा धत्तां पुष्करस्रजा ॥२॥

या मेधा अम्भरासु<sup>8</sup> गंधर्वेषु च यन्मनः ।

दैवी या मानुषी मेधा<sup>9</sup> सा माया विशतादिमां ॥३॥<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> विदुः M.

<sup>2</sup> Âśv. Mantra-samhitā (MS. Wa. 144), p. 154.

<sup>3</sup> दधा m.

<sup>4</sup> मे MS. Wa. 144.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Vāj. Samh. XXXII. 15. Tait. Âr. X. 40.

<sup>6</sup> ते S. 2.

<sup>7</sup> ते m. S. 2.

<sup>8</sup> रासो S. 2. रेपु m.

<sup>9</sup> रासु M. <sup>10</sup> युगा m.

<sup>11</sup> See Tait. Âr. X. 41.

यन्मे नोक्तं तद्रमतां<sup>1</sup> शक्यं यदनु ब्रुवे<sup>2</sup> ।  
 निशामतं निशामहै मयि व्रतं सह प्रियेण भूयासं । ब्रह्मणा सं गमेमहि ॥३॥<sup>3</sup>  
 शरीरं मे विचक्षणं वाङ्मे मधुमत्तमा ।<sup>4</sup>  
 अवृद्धमहमसौ<sup>5</sup> सूर्यो ब्रह्मणानी<sup>6</sup> स्य श्रुतं मे मा प्र हासीः ॥५॥<sup>7</sup>  
 मेधां देवीं मनसा रेजमानां गंधर्वैर्जुष्टां प्रति नो जुषस्व ।  
 मह्यं मेधां वद मह्यं श्रियं वद मेधावी<sup>8</sup> भूयासमजराजरिष्णुः ॥६॥  
 सदसस्पतिमद्भुतं प्रियमिन्द्रस्य काम्यं ।  
 सनिं मेधामयासिपं ॥७॥<sup>9</sup>  
 यां मेधां देवगणाः पितरश्चोपासते ।  
 तथा मामद्य मेधयाग्ने मेधाविनं कुरु<sup>10</sup> ॥८॥<sup>11</sup>  
 मेधाव्यहं सुमनाः सुप्रतीकः श्रद्धामनाः सत्यमतिः<sup>12</sup> सुशेवः ।  
 महायशा धारयिष्णुः प्रवक्ता<sup>13</sup> भूयासमये<sup>14</sup> स्वधया प्रयोगे ॥९॥

P. 546. l. 17. (X. 155, 1.) एक्के in the text, not एकः, which is the reading of MS. Pada Taylor only. The Śruti passages may be seen in the Âśvalâyana Gṛihya Sūtras III. 3, and in a somewhat different form in the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa XI. 5, 6.

P. 554. l. 19. (X. 158, 1.) The second Viniyoga, preserved in Ca., but in fragments only, had to be supplied from VII. 27, 13.

P. 560. l. 22. (X. 160, 4.) The na is left out by Śaṅkara.

P. 561. l. 1. (X. 161, 5.) The quotation इन्द्रो देवाशु न is wrong. It is omitted in B 1. B 4; but not in CB. A. Ca. C Mill give it: शुनं नः, or शुना.

P. 561. l. 23. (X. 161, 5.) Instead of आतुरस्य the MSS. have आधितस्य A. Ca. C Mill, CB; deest in B 1. B 4.

P. 566. l. 19. (X. 163, 1.) छुवुकाच्छुवुकात् ॥ छुवुकात् चुंचुकात् A. छुवुकात् कुवुकात् C Mill. छुवुकात् चुचुकाद् Ca.; deest in B 1. B 4. CB.

P. 567. l. 21. (X. 163, 8.) मतस्रौ as masculine, clearly the kidneys, the form of which in man corresponds to the mango fruit. Is मतस्रे different? The explanation हृदयास्थिविशेष, as given by Mahidhara, seems nonsensical.

P. 572. l. 14. (X. 165, 3.) अन्नं तस्मिन्निति, probably with pradeśa understood.

P. 573. l. 17. (X. 166, 1.) A. and Ca. add a Viniyoga. प्रयाणसमये निर्गमनार्थं न एतत्सूत्रितं च । कृष्णं मा समानानामित्यभिन्नमेवेति A. प्रयाणसमये निर्गमनमार्गे जपेत् सूत्रितं च । कृष्णं मा समानानामित्यभिन्नमेवेति Ca. C Mill agrees with A. The other MSS. have nothing.

<sup>1</sup> तद्रमतां m. प्रद्र S. 2. भद्र M. <sup>2</sup> ब्रवे M. द्रवे m. <sup>3</sup> निशामत निशा मयि श्रुतं सह व्रतेन भूयासं M. निशामयि मयि व्रतं m. निशामतं निशामहै मयि व्रतं सह व्रतेषु भूय ॥ सं S. 2. <sup>4</sup> मधुमदुहा S. 2. मधुमदुहा M. मधु दुहा m. <sup>5</sup> अवृत् m. <sup>6</sup> ण्य आणी M. <sup>7</sup> णीत् m. <sup>8</sup> णि m. <sup>9</sup> Vāj. Samh. XXXII. 13. Rv. I. 18, 6. <sup>10</sup> मेधया मे मेधाविनं S. 2. मा मद्य मेधाग्ने मेधाविनं यं कुरु m. मामद्य मेधयाग्ने M. विनं कुरु M. <sup>11</sup> See Atharva-veda VI. 108, 4. Vāj. Samh. XXXII. 14. <sup>12</sup> सुपः m. <sup>13</sup> प्रवक्ता S. 2. <sup>14</sup> णस्यै S. 2.

P. 578. l. 8. (X. 168, 2.) Sāyana seems to have read खयुक् Ca. खयुक् A. C Mill. सुयुक् B 1. CB. B 4.

P. 583. l. 4. (X. 170, 4.) धर्मकाले B 4. CB. धर्मकाले A. C Mill. कमलोके Ca.; deest in B 1.

P. 583. l. 24. (X. 171, 2.) After तद्भिप्रायेणेदमुक्ते, A. Ca. and C Mill add a quotation, which I cannot find. श्रूयते हि तस्येंद्रो वचिरूपेण धनुज्यामन्वि रुद्रस्य त्वेव धनु रात्रिं शिर उत्तिपेय । स प्रवाग्भ्या भवदिति A. ज्यामन्वि रुद्रस्य त्वेव धं वे नुरात्रिं शिर उत्तिपेय etc. C Mill. श्रूयते हि तस्येंद्रो वचिरूपेण धनुज्योमिच्छति तथा रुद्रस्य त्वेव धं हरो त्रिः शिर उत्तिपेय स प्रवग्भ्या भवदिति Ca. The story is told in different Brāhmaṇas, but not in this form. We have it in the Śatapatha, at the beginning of the fourteenth book; in the Taittiriya-āraṇyaka, at the beginning of the fourth Prapāṭhaka, with the explanatory portion in the fifth Prapāṭhaka; also in the Tāṇḍya-brāhmaṇa VII. 5, 6; and Aitareya-brāhmaṇa I. 18. I have restored the text conjecturally, but I feel doubtful about Rudra.

P. 589. l. 3. (X. 174, 2.) The commentary to this verse is wanting in all the MSS.

P. 594. l. 12. (X. 177, 1.) हृदा हृत्स्येन । तात्स्थ्यान्नाच्छब्दं ॥ चक्षुषे तता तस्य जो वद्यं A. हृत्स्ये त तातस्य जो व द्य C Mill. हृदा हृत्स्येन तास्या ता छब्दां । Ca. हृदा हृत्स्येना तात्स्था । ता छ द्यं B 1. हृत्स्ये तता रा तस्यान्नाच्छब्दं CB. हृदा हृत्स्ये तेनात्मना B 4. sec. man.

P. 594. l. 23. (X. 177, 1.) वृत्तिज्ञानानां A. B 1. B 4. वृत्तिज्ञानानां C Mill. दत्तिज्ञानानां CB; deest in Ca.

P. 596. l. 12. (X. 178, 1.) तात्स्थ्यपुत्रः A. Ca. C Mill, B 4. B 1. CB.

P. 596. l. 23. (X. 178, 1.) On गर्गादिः etc. see notes in Preface.

P. 597. l. 9. (X. 178, 1.) जयतेवै इप्रत्ययः ॥ द्रुप्रत्ययः A. इप्रत्ययः C Mill, B 4. B 1. CB. इडप्रत्ययः Ca. Sāma-veda, p. 674, यजतेवै इडप्रत्ययः.

P. 604. l. 22. (X. 183, 1.) चक्षुः ॥ अंता चक्षुः A. CB. अंता चक्षुः C Mill. इत्याचरु क्रमेण Ca. अन्चक्षुः B 1. अत्यचः B 4. sec. man.

P. 606. l. 26. (X. 184, 1.) गर्भपातापप्रसवा ॥ स्त्रावपातापप्रसवा A. C Mill. स्त्रावपातापप्रसवा Ca. स्त्रावपातापप्रसवा B 4. sec. man. सावपातापप्रसवा B 1. स्त्रावपातापप्रसवा CB.

After hymn 184 (VIII. 8, 42) the following Khila occurs :

नेजमे<sup>1</sup> परा पत सुपुत्रः पुनरा पत ।<sup>2</sup>  
अस्य मे पुत्रकामायै गर्भमा धेहि यः पुमान् ॥ १ ॥  
यथेयं पृथिवी मनुजाना गर्भमादधे ।  
एवं तं गर्भमा धेहि दशमे मासि सूतवे ॥ २ ॥<sup>3</sup>  
विष्णोः श्रेष्ठेन रूपेणास्यां नायी गवीत्यां ।  
पुमांसं<sup>4</sup> पुत्राना धेहि दशमे मासि सूतवे ॥ ३ ॥<sup>5</sup>

After hymn 187, 8. (VIII. 8, 45.) the following Khila occurs :

अनीकवतमूतयेऽग्निं गोभिर्हवामहे । स नः पथेदति द्विषः ॥

<sup>1</sup> तेज° M. <sup>2</sup> Âśv. Grihya I. 14. Âśv. Mantra-saṃhitā (MS. Wa. 144), p. 131.

<sup>3</sup> Atharva-veda V. 25, 2.

<sup>4</sup> दशास्यां.

<sup>5</sup> Atharva-veda V. 25, 10.

P. 614. l. 16. (X. 189, 3.) स्तूयते सूर्यं सर्वत इत्यर्थः ॥ स्तूयते सूर्यं सवत इत्यर्थः A. C Mill. सेवत इत्यर्थः Ca. स्तूयते सूर्यं स्तवत इत्यर्थः B 1. B 4. सूर्यं सवन इत्यर्थः CB.

P. 614. l. 21. (X. 190, 1.) त्वात्तादृग्रूप ॥ त्वात् ऋग्रूप A. C Mill. त्वादृग्रूप Ca. त्वात् ऋग्रूप B 1. B 4. CB.

P. 616. l. 21. (X. 191, 1.) After किंच there is खिन्नः A. C Mill. खि न B 4. सितो पीडायाः Ca. खिन्नः CB. खि नः B 1. It may have been meant for स त्वं, or तत् स्थितोऽपि.

After hymn 191 (VIII. 8, 49), at the end of the Samhitâ, the following Khila occurs:

संज्ञानमुशनावदत्संज्ञानं वरुणोऽवदत् ।  
 संज्ञानमिन्द्रश्चाग्निश्च संज्ञानं सवितावदत् ॥१॥  
 संज्ञानं वः खेभ्यः संज्ञानमरणेभ्यः ।<sup>1</sup>  
 संज्ञानमश्विना युवमिहास्मासु नि यच्छतं ॥  
 यत्कक्षीवात्संवतनो पुत्रो अंगिरसामवे ।<sup>2</sup>  
 तेन नोऽद्य विष्टे देवाः सं प्रियां समजीजनत् ॥  
 सं वो मनांसि जानतां समाकूतिमैनामसि ।<sup>3</sup>  
 असौ यो विमता जनस्तं समावर्तयामसि ॥  
 तच्छंयोरा वृणीमहे गातुं यज्ञाय गातुं यज्ञपतये ।<sup>4</sup>  
 देवी स्वस्तिरस्तु नः स्वस्तिमानुषेभ्यः ॥३॥  
 ऊर्ध्वं जिगातु भेषजं । शं नो अस्तु द्विपदे शं चतुष्पदे ॥

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tait. Br. II. 4, 4, 6. Atharva-veda VII. 52, 1.

<sup>2</sup> °सा भवेत् Âśv. Mant. Samh. (MS. Wa. 144), p. 178.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Atharva-veda III. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Tait. Samh. II. 6, 10. Tait. Br. III. 5, 11. Tait. Âr. I. 9, 7.

# VARIETAS LECTIONIS.

## Maṇḍala IX.

Page 2. line 14. (IX. 1, 4.) °सा धानाद्यन्ने° ॥ °सात्सकेनान्नेन A. Ca.; both in marg. धानाद्या. °सा रसात्सकेनान्नेन C. Mill. °सात्सकेनान्नेन B 4. °सा धात्सकेनान्नेन B 1.

P. 3. l. 17. (IX. 1, 8.) °सदृशंशुनेनं सोमं A. Ca. सदृशंशुनेनं सोमं C. Mill. सदृशंशुं सोमं B 4. सदृशं मधु सोमं B 1.

P. 4. l. 19. (IX. 2, 2.) पारः पानीयमंध ॥ पारः पानीयमंध अन्धं B 1. पारः पानीयमंध A. Ca. B 4. पारः पसानीयमंध C. Mill.

P. 5. l. 11. (IX. 2, 5.) मृजे । मृज्यते ॥ मृजे मृज्यते A. Ca. B 1. 4. मर्ज्यते C. Mill. मर्मज्यते (Pāṇ. VII. 4, 91, vārt.) would hardly suit Sāyaṇa's style, unless verse 7 was in his mind while he was writing.

P. 6. l. 10. (IX. 2, 9.) °स्यामन्नस्य C. Mill. °स्यामन्नस्य A. Ca. °स्य सोमस्य B 1. 4.

P. 11. l. 16. (IX. 5.) काश्यपस्य पा° C. Mill. शौनकस्य पा° A. शौनकस्य पा° Ca. शौनकस्याप्रस्तुतं in B 1 after the words पंचमं सूक्तं; the same in B 4, but altered into शौनकस्याप्रोक्तं.

P. 12. l. 5. (IX. 5, 2.) अद्भ्योऽश्वो जा° ॥ अभ्यः सवो जा° A. अभ्यः संवो जा° Ca. अभ्यः संवो जा° C. Mill. B 4 omits the quotation. As the volume of MS. B 1, which contains the last portion of the sixth Asṭaka, could not be found in the India Office Library when I came to print the various readings, I have been obliged in several passages, where I was not quite certain of the accuracy of my collations, to omit the readings of that MS. (from p. 1 to p. 85 of this volume), being unable to verify my notes.

P. 14. l. 24. (IX. 6, 1.) The quotation from the Anukramanikā left out in all the MSS.

P. 17. l. 10. (IX. 7, 1.) असृयं । सृज्यते ॥ A. has between these words हविर्द्वाना, in marg. युजो युक्तान्; Ca. हविर्द्वानाँ, and in marg. युजो युक्ता वान्; C. Mill हविर्द्वाना, and nothing in marg.; B 1. असृयं युक्तान् ज्यते; B 4. असृयं - - सृज्यते, in marg. हविर्धानं. As A. Ca. C. Mill in verse 3 leave out the words युजो युक्ता वाचः, there can be no doubt that these words, written on the margin, were transferred by mistake from the third to the first verse. The two little strokes placed over the word हविर्द्वाना, in order to show that this word should be left out altogether, induced the copyist to insert युजो युक्ता after असृयं.

P. 19. l. 10. (IX. 7, 9.) संजयतं ॥ The MSS. have संजयितं.

P. 20. l. 4. (IX. 8, 3.) अभिलिपितः ॥ अभिपितः A. Ca. अभिलिपितः C. Mill. अभिपुतः B 4. B 1 leaves the word out.

P. 20. l. 16. (IX. 8, 5.) लोमानि कमुदकं चात्यभि सृजा° ॥ लोमानि ---- दत्यभिमुजा Ca. लोमानि ---- द अभिमुजा° A. लोमानि ---- द अतिसृजा° C. Mill. लोमनि के उदके चांति अभि सृजा° B 1. 4.

P. 25. l. 17. (IX. 10, 6.) हरस आहरस आहर्तारश्च ॥ हरसः हा आहर्तारश्च आहर्तारश्च A. Ca. हरस आहर्तारश्च C. Mill. हरसे हरसः आहरसः आहर्तारश्च B 1. हरसः आहर्तारश्च B 4, the preceding words being struck out.

P. 26. l. 7. (IX. 10, 9.) दीप्तस्यात्मनः C. Mill. दीप्तस्यामुनः A. Ca. दीप्तस्य स्वर्गस्य B 1. 4.

P. 28. l. 18. (IX. 12, 1.) गृहे only in B 1. 4.

P. 31. l. 4. (IX. 13, 1.) सुमतिना संगमेन । Ca. C. Mill. समतीना संगमेन A.; deest in B 4. At first sight the reading of A. सुमतीना संगमेन would suggest the very simple correction सुमतीना संगमेन, by the assembly of the friends, or of the right-minded Paṇḍits. Such an expression, however, was never used before by Śāyana when speaking of the authorship of his commentary, nor is it clear why so simple a phrase should have been misunderstood and changed into सुमतिना संगमेन. I have left the reading as we find it in the MSS., but I am by no means certain that it is correct. If it is, we must suppose that the passage was taken over from the original commentary of Mādhava, who was the prime minister of Sangama, the predecessor of Bukka; and that Mādhava ascribed to him the merit of having preserved and shown to his people the right meaning of the Veda by means of the patronage which he bestowed on Mādhava and his literary school. See Lassen, Indische Allerthumskunde, IV. 161; Weber, Katalog der Berl. Handschriften, p. 222.

P. 32. l. 17. (IX. 13, 5.) द्योतनादिगुणकाः only Ca. - गुणकाराः C. Mill. - गुणयुक्ताः B 4. द्योतमानादिगुणकाः A.

P. 32. l. 24. (IX. 13, 6.) A. and Ca. have a lacuna after अतिसृज्यन्ते; C. Mill goes on from °ते to अथ सप्तमी; B 4. अन्नलाभाय असृज्यं अतिसृज्यन्ते किं प्रति अन्नं अविभवं वारं वालं दशायपचितं प्रतीत्यर्थः.

P. 33. l. 25. (IX. 14, 1.) सोमः and तरंगे (गं B 4) - रसे only in B 1. 4.

P. 34. l. 6. (IX. 14, 2.) मनुष्या यजमानाः and गिरा स्तुत्या only in B 1. 4.

P. 34. l. 19. (IX. 14, 4.) A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4 have a lacuna from विविधं धावति to यदा.

P. 35. l. 11. (IX. 14, 6.) B 4 adds विदे जानते यजमानाय after प्रेरयति, and inserts यं before चनुं.

P. 36. l. 12. (IX. 15, 2.) धीशब्दाद्यकारो°. See Rv. I. 8, 6.

P. 37. l. 6. (IX. 15, 5.) All अध्वर्यादिभिः.

P. 37. l. 7. (IX. 15, 5.) वेजनवान् Ca. विज° A. वज° C. Mill. वेगवान् B 4.

P. 37. l. 8. (IX. 15, 5.) भवन् य ईयत इति A. Ca. C. Mill. भवन् यं ईयत इति B 4.

P. 37. l. 20. (IX. 15, 8.) सोमे after मृज्यमाने C. Mill.

P. 38. l. 19. (IX. 16, 2.) गवां सोतारं A. Ca. C. Mill. गोवां गवां क्षीरादिना इत्यर्थः B 4.

- P. 38. l. 26. (IX. 16, 3.) तवोच्यते C. Mill. तवोच्यते A. Ca. B 4. Probably किमर्थं was left out.
- P. 39. l. 5. (IX. 16, 4.) अर्षति । गच्छति । Ca. A. अर्षति प्रगच्छति C. Mill. प्र अर्षति । गच्छति B 4.
- P. 39. l. 23. (IX. 16, 7.) पिप्पुष्याप्यायन्ती ॥ पिप्पुषी अप्यायती B 4; deest in A. Ca. C. Mill.
- P. 40. l. 4. (IX. 16, 8.) After विपश्चितं, स्तोत्रनामैतत्, and after आयुषु, इतरेषु C. Mill.
- P. 40. l. 4. (IX. 16, 8.) अथवा तृतीयायै ॥ अथा तृ° A. Ca. अथ तृ° C. Mill; deest in B 4.
- P. 40. l. 6. (IX. 16, 8.) प्राणयितुं C. Mill. प्राणयितुं A. Ca.; deest in B 4.
- P. 42. l. 14. (IX. 18, 1.) सर्वथा असि । सर्वस्य धाता° C. Mill; A. and Ca. leave out the words असि । सर्वस्य धा. सर्वथा (marg. सर्वधाता) सर्वधाता वासि B 4.
- P. 43. l. 4. (IX. 18, 4.) धनानि B 4.
- P. 43. l. 5. (IX. 18, 4.) अथवा only C. Mill.
- P. 43. l. 22. (IX. 18, 7.) °त्तरपादो नेयः ॥ °त्तरपादोनेयः Ca. A. °त्तरपादो नेयः C. Mill. उत्तरपाद उन्नेयः would have been the more usual form. Left out in B 4, where कलशेषु is added.
- P. 44. l. 17. (IX. 19, 3.) वृषा कामानां वर्षकः सोमः B 4.
- P. 45. l. 1. (IX. 19, 4.) प्रवृद्धिकामा A. Ca. प्रवर्द्धिका C. Mill. B 4 varies considerably: धीतयः धीयमानाः सोमाख्येन वत्सेन धीयमानाः मातः निर्माच्यः वसतीवर्षः अधि रेतसि स्वकीये सारे वृषभस्य वर्षकस्य सूतोः अभिषूयमाणस्य वत्सस्य सोमस्य सोमं अवावशंत मीलितवंतः ।
- P. 45. l. 14. (IX. 19, 6.) शत्रूणां रयिं B 4. शत्रूणां रयिं C. Mill. शत्रुरयिं A. Ca.
- P. 46. l. 22. (IX. 20, 4.) हविष्मद्भ्यो only C. Mill.
- P. 48. l. 17. (IX. 21, 4.) रथमभिमतं देशं प्राप्तुवन्ति । A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. One expects प्रापयन्ति; as it is, Sâyana must have taken रथं in the sense of अर्थ, and then explained it by अभिमतं देशं.
- P. 48. l. 23. (IX. 21, 5.) A. Ca. C. Mill have a lacuna after अरावा; B 4. अरावा आदानु-शब्दरहितः संपन्नः सन् प्रयच्छति तथा अयच्छत्. Sâyana probably explained अरावा by अदाता न किञ्चित्प्रयच्छति प्राप्तकाम स एव etc.
- P. 49. l. 5. (IX. 21, 6.) आदिशे स्वामिनि B 4. आदिशे सं स्वामिनि A. Ca. C. Mill.
- P. 49. l. 15. (IX. 21, 7.) All MSS. प्रेरयन्.
- P. 49. l. 23. (IX. 22, 1.) दृष्टान्तद्वयं । आजौ सृष्टाः शीघ्राः रथा इव तथा उक्कलक्षणसर्गाः वाजिन इव सृष्टाः अश्वा इव B 4.
- P. 50. l. 4. (IX. 22, 2.) वाता इव वायव इव ॥ वाता वायव A. Ca. वा इव वायव C. Mill. वाता इव वायवः इव B 4.
- P. 50. l. 17. (IX. 22, 4.) शाम्यन्ति A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4.
- P. 51. l. 23. (IX. 23, 2.) आयवः B 4. आशवः A. Ca. C. Mill.
- P. 51. l. 24. (IX. 23, 2.) रूपकव्याहारेण ॥ रूपकयद्वाहारेण A. रूपकयद्वाहारेण Ca. रूपकव्याहारेण C. Mill. Rûpakavyâhâra means a metaphor or a play on words, Soma being both the juice and the moon. B 4 reads अनुक्रमते । एतैः सोमैः रुचे दीप्तौ सूर्ये जननं कुर्वतीत्यर्थः ।
- P. 51. l. 25. (IX. 23, 2.) कुर्वति । दीप्तं ॥ only C. Mill.
- P. 52. l. 4. (IX. 23, 3.) अदाशुषोऽप्रयच्छतो B 4. अदाशुषः प्रयच्छतः A. Ca. C. Mill.
- P. 52. l. 5. (IX. 23, 3.) प्रजावतीः इषः अन्नानि B 4.
- P. 52. l. 10. (IX. 23, 4.) तन्नामिश्रितो ॥ तथा मिश्रितो A. Ca. तथा - मिश्रितो C. Mill. मिश्रितो B 4.



P. 52. l. 11. (IX. 23, 4.) तमभि पवंत इति शेषः ॥ अभिपंचंत A. Ca. अभिपवंत C. Mill. अभिपचते इति शेषः किमर्थं नदे नद मदाय हर्षाय B 4.

P. 53. l. 1. (IX. 23, 7.) अस्य B 4. अपि C. Mill. इति A. Ca.

P. 53. l. 18. (IX. 24, 2.) आहुतिम्... only in A. Ca.

P. 54. l. 11. (IX. 24, 5.) उदराय ॥ उदाराय Ca. A. C. Mill; B 4 leaves the word out.

P. 54. l. 15. (IX. 24, 6.) हंतरेन्द्र A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. It should be इंदो, but the mistake is so constant that it would not be safe to correct it against the authority of all the MSS. In the Sâma-veda commentary we find हे सोम.

P. 54. l. 21. (IX. 24, 7.) सुतस्याभिषुतस्य मध्यः मदकरस्य वत्यात्मक सोमो A. C. Mill, Ca. वत्यात्मकः B 4.

P. 55. l. 13. (IX. 25, 2.) अंगुल्या only C. Mill.

P. 55. l. 19. (IX. 25, 3.) वृषा कामानां वर्षकः कविः क्रांतप्रज्ञः B 4.

P. 56. l. 7. (IX. 25, 5.) आयुषक् B 4. आनुषक् A. Ca. C. Mill.

P. 57. l. 20. (IX. 26, 5.) जामयोऽंगुलगः B 4.

P. 58. l. 1. (IX. 26, 6.) इंदुं etc. A. Ca. C. Mill. B 4 reads इंदो, and explains it at the beginning of the verse, हे पवमान पूयमान इंदो दीप्त सोम.

P. 58. l. 2. (IX. 26, 6.) दीप्तं स्रुपं A. Ca. C. Mill; deest in B 4; probably दीप्तस्वरूपं, some other explanation being dropt.

P. 59. l. 13. (IX. 27, 5.) सोमस्रावणे सूर्यस्य कः प्रसंग इति न वाच्यं सूर्यरश्मिभिरेव सोमस्याप्यायनात् ॥ समस्रावणे सूर्यस्य कः प्रसंग इति न वाच्यं तं C. Mill. B 4 has the simpler explanation, परित्यज्यते । सूर्येण कपमिति चेत् सूर्यरश्मिभिः एव सोमस्याप्यायनात्सूर्येणेति उक्तं. Instead of सोमस्रावणे one might conjecture रसोस्रावणे, as coming nearer to the letters of the MSS.

P. 59. l. 19. (IX. 27, 6.) इंदुदीप्तश्चैवेन्द्रमा ॥ °दीप्तश्च इवेन्द्रमा A. Ca. दीप्तश्च एवेन्द्रमा C. Mill. दीप्तश्च इंद्रे चा B 4.

P. 61. l. 19. (IX. 29, 2.) जज्ञानं जायमानं C. Mill. जज्ञानं जातं यमानं A. Ca. जज्ञानं जातं B 4.

P. 62. l. 1. (IX. 29, 3.) शोभनाभिभावुकानि । from Sâyaṇa's commentary on the Sâma-veda; our MSS. have शोभनानि भावुकानि; B 4. शोभनानि only.

P. 62. l. 13. (IX. 29, 5.) कंचनामुंचन्नित्यर्थः ॥ कंचन अमुंचंतिनित्यर्थः A. अमुंचंतिनित्यर्थः Ca. अमुंचंनित्यर्थः C. Mill. कस्य चित् कस्यापि यत् B 4.

P. 63. l. 9. (IX. 30, 2.) अपि - करं ॥ The lacuna exists in A. Ca. अपि करे C. Mill. B 4 omits the whole explanation; Sâyaṇa on the Sâma-veda gives no help. It may have been इन्द्रियमपि वा बलकरं.

P. 64. l. 8. (IX. 30, 6.) ब्रूते यजमानः स्वीयान् ॥ ब्रूयते जमास्वीयान् A. ब्रूयते जमास्वीयान् Ca. ब्रूते य - मानस्वीयान् C. Mill; deest in B 4.

P. 64. l. 23. (IX. 31, 2.) भवास्सभ्यमि° ॥ भवास्सदिमि° C. Mill. भवास्सदिमि° A. Ca. B 4 reads the last part °द्युस्समस्ति तस्य अधि भव वर्धयिता भव.

P. 67. l. 9. (IX. 32, 6.) अस्मे B 4.

P. 67. l. 10. (IX. 32, 6.) मह्यमभ्यमि° ॥ मह्यमभ्यमि° Ca. A. मभ्यमि° C. Mill; deest in B 4.

P. 67. l. 12. (IX. 32, 6.) किंच सनिं— वगैः C. Mill; left out in A. Ca. B 4.

P. 67. l. 19. (IX. 33, 1.) प्रगच्छन्ति । C. Mill. प्रणयन्ति A. Ca. प्रनयन्ति प्रगच्छन्ति B 4.

P. 67. l. 20. (IX. 33, 1.) किमिव ॥ किं A. Ca. किंच C. Mill, B 4.

P. 67. l. 20. (IX. 33, 1.) अपामूर्मयो न ॥ C. Mill. अपामूर्मयः तं A. Ca. अपामूर्मयः (यथा) B 4.

P. 67. l. 20. (IX. 33, 1.) दृष्टान्तो दर्शितो ॥ दृष्टान्तदर्पितो A. Ca. दृष्टान्तःदर्शितो C. Mill; deest in B 4.

P. 68. l. 3. (IX. 33, 2.) चतस्यामृतस्य B 4.

P. 68. l. 4. (IX. 33, 2.) अथवैकं ॥ अथैकं A. Ca. C. Mill; deest in B 4. The same MSS. insert before अथ, अस्माकं, a marginal gloss, originally intended as explanatory of वाजं.

P. 69. l. 4. (IX. 33, 6.) मुद्रितभू° ॥ भूतभूद्रितभू° A. Ca. सुतद्रितभू° C. Mill; deest in B 4. मुद्रितः सगते भू° Sâma-veda com. समुद्रः is derived by some native authorities from मुद्रा in the sense of limit, so as to signify "bounded by continents." See Wilson, s. v.

P. 69. l. 22. (IX. 34, 3.) सुन्वन्ति B 4.

P. 70. l. 1. (IX. 34, 4.) - द्रष्टुर्च्येः सोऽयं ॥ द्रष्टु च्यये म° A. द्रष्टु च्यये यं म° Ca. द्रष्टुर्च्ययं म° C. Mill. च्यवेः यो यं म° B 4. P. 70. l. 2. शुद्धो B 4.

P. 70. l. 8. (IX. 34, 5.) चारु मनोहरं B 4. सोमं A. Ca. C. Mill after साधनं.

P. 71. l. 18. (IX. 35, 4.) यजमानेभ्यः B 4. चृचमानेभ्यः A. Ca. C. Mill leaves out the first part of the verse.

P. 72. l. 18. (IX. 36, 1.) कार्म्यं युद्धमितरेतरर्षणात् ॥ काप्म यध्वं इतरेतरर्षणात् A. Ca. कार्म्यं यध्वं इतारतरर्षणात् C. Mill. In B 4 this passage is left out.

P. 73. l. 5. (IX. 36, 3.) बलप्रदाय यागाय A. Ca. बलप्रदानाय C. Mill; left out in B 4.

P. 74. l. 15. (IX. 37, 3.) स्वर्गस्य B 4.

P. 74. l. 21. (IX. 37, 4.) महर्षेऽपि ॥ महर्षयश्चपि A. Ca. C. Mill. महर्षेः यत् अपि B 4.

P. 75. ll. 15 and 17. (IX. 38, 1.) सः and उ पूरणः B 4.

P. 76. l. 9. (IX. 38, 4.) पुनः क इव only C. Mill.

P. 77. l. 10. (IX. 39, 2.) अनिष्कृतमसंस्कृतं Sâma-veda com. अनिष्कृतं संस्कृतं A. Ca. B 4. अनिष्कृतः संस्कृतः C. Mill.

P. 80. l. 11. (IX. 41, 1.) एवं वोपमीयन्ते ॥ एवं चो° A. Ca. एवं चो° C. Mill. B 4 leaves it out.

P. 80. l. 11. (IX. 41, 1.) गावः in यथा गावः स्वगोष्ठं only C. Mill.

P. 80. l. 12. (IX. 41, 1.) क्षिप्रास् only C. Mill. A. and Ca. do not explain the word भूर्खेयः. B 4 in the next line has क्षरणशीलाः.

P. 80. l. 13. (IX. 41, 1.) अपघ्नतः B 4.

P. 80. l. 14. (IX. 41, 1.) स्तुतेति शेषः C. Mill. स्तुवतेति शेषः A. Ca. B 4.

P. 80. l. 19. (IX. 41, 2.) बंधनं दुराचं दुष्टमतिं च ॥ A. and Ca. leave out the words बंधनं दुराचं. B 4 reads सेतुं राक्षसबंधनं दुराचं राक्षसां हननबुद्धिं. C. Mill बंधनं दुराच्येतद्वयंष्टमति च.

P. 80. l. 19. (IX. 41, 2.) अन्नतमकर्मणां ॥ अन्नतकर्मणां A. Ca. अन्नतं कर्मणां B 4. अन्नतकर्मणां C. Mill.

P. 81. l. 15. (IX. 41, 2.) तदुपलक्षितमहर्ष्यते ॥ तदुपल - तमज्यते A. तदुपलक्ष - तमज्यते C. Mill; deest in B 4.

P. 82. l. 21. (IX. 42, 4.) दुहानो दधानः ॥ A. Ca. C. Mill दधानः only. B 4. दुहानः only.

P. 84. l. 18. (IX. 43, 5.) अयमिदुवै° ॥ यमिदवा° A. यमिदवा Ca. C. Mill. यः इदुः B 4.

P. 84. l. 20. (IX. 43, 5.) इडभावे च ॥ इडभावश्च A. Ca. C. Mill; deest in B 4.

P. 87. l. 1. (IX. 44, 1.) From the beginning of the seventh Aṣṭaka B. stands for B 1, while B 4, unless specially mentioned, agrees with A.

P. 88. l. 1. (IX. 44, 3.) सुतोऽभिषुत B 1. सुते भिषुत A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. The Pada MSS. read सुतः.

P. 89. l. 9. (IX. 45, 2.) अभिगच्छ ॥ °गच्छति A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. °गच्छतु B 1.

P. 89. l. 10. (IX. 45, 2.) पीयसे A. Ca. B 1. 4. पीड्यसे? cf. Rv. IX. 27, 1.

P. 89. l. 16. (IX. 45, 3.) वासयामः संस्कुर्मः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. चंजयामः B 1.

P. 90. l. 5. (IX. 45, 5.) अतिक्रांतं दशा° A. Ca. C. Mill. अतिक्रांतदनग° B 1. अतिक्रांतदशा° B 4.

P. 90. l. 6. (IX. 45, 5.) °षत । अस्तुवन् ॥ °षतस्तुवन् A. Ca. C. Mill. °षतास्तावन् B 1. °षतास्तुवन् B 4.

P. 90. l. 14. (IX. 46, Introd. and v. 1.) असृयन् only in B 1 and in marg. of Ca. The other MSS. read असृग्.

P. 91. l. 12. (IX. 46, 4.) The Pada has शुक्रा, not शुक्राः.

P. 91. l. 24. (IX. 46, 6.) त्रिशः. The MSS. विशः with exception of B 1, which has अखिलयः क्षिप इति.

P. 92. l. 14. (IX. 47, 2.) The commentary is defective in all MSS. कृतानि, in the beginning, is only in the marg. of CB. There are no various readings to help in restoring the first half except conjecturally. Instead of अस्माभिरेव, A. has अस्माभिरेव. In the second part of the commentary चयते is explained by चातयति in A., वातयति in Ca. C. Mill, चापति in B 1. (CB. has the marginal correction चापयति.) See Rv. Bh. I. 167, 8, where Sây. explains चयते by चायति विनाशयति, and where the MSS. do not vary. Here, however, the MSS. are so decidedly in favour of चातयति that I left it as a possible reminiscence of Nir. IV. 25. All the Sanhitâ MSS. read चयते with short â, a fact which it is necessary to state as the authors of the Petersburg lexicon state the contrary, and found some conclusions on the supposed length of the vowel.

P. 93. l. 1. (IX. 47, 4.) सोमो only B 1; the other MSS. सो.

P. 94. l. 5. (IX. 48, 3.) C. Mill has a lacuna from सुक्रतुः to the beginning of hymn 50, उक्तो विनियोगः ॥ A. has between त्वामतो and दिवो the word स्फि; the same is in Ca., with a mark over it; C. Mill reads त्वामहतो दिवो; B 1. त्वामतो दिवो. All MSS. have सुक्रतुः सुप्रज्ञो°. In the beginning B 1 leaves out सुक्रतो° - °मान.

P. 94. l. 13. (IX. 48, 4.) साधारणमित्समान° 1. This is the reading of the Sâma-veda com. All our MSS. have साधारणमित्समान°, except B 1, which reads साधारणमित्यामान°.

P. 94. l. 13. (IX. 48, 4.) खर्दृशे सर्वदृशे ॥ सर्वदृशे A. खर्वदृशे Ca. खर्दृशे B 1. खर्दृशे Extr. (These extracts are taken from some loose sheets containing passages of Sâyana's commentary.)

P. 94. l. 18. (IX. 48, 5.) अथाथ B 1. अथात A. Ca. अथातः Extr.

P. 96. l. 16. (IX. 50, 2.) गच्छति B 1. Extr. गच्छति A. Ca. C. Mill.

P. 96. l. 20. (IX. 50, 3.) B 1 has a lacuna from हरित° - हिन्वंति.

P. 96. l. 26. (IX. 50, 4.) See Rv. IX. 25, 6.

P. 98. l. 2. (IX. 51, 3.) व्यसृते all MSS. व्यासृते deest in C. Mill and B 1.

P. 98. l. 7. (IX. 51, 4.) देवान्प्र° ॥ देवानप्र° A. Ca. C. Mill.

P. 98. l. 12. (IX. 51, 5.) गच्छ ॥ All MSS. have गच्छसि.

P. 99. l. 12. (IX. 52, 2.) अवे: only C. Mill.

P. 100. l. 10. (IX. 53, 2.) कृते° ॥ प्रकृते° B 1.

P. 100. l. 12. (IX. 53, 2.) निमित्ते Extr. निमित्त A. Ca. C. Mill. निमित B 1. निमित्तं B 4.

P. 100. l. 17. (IX. 53, 3.) त्वां यो दुर्वुद्धिः ॥ त्वां पु यो दु° A. Ca. C. Mill. त्वां यो दुर्वधि B 1.

P. 101. l. 7. (IX. 54, 1.) °परिमितस्य दातारं ऋषीमतीन्द्रियस्य कर्मफलस्य दृष्टारं पयः B 1.

P. 105. l. 26. (IX. 58, 3.) उत्तममास्त्विति A. B 4. Ca. उत्तमस्त्विति B 1. It ought to be अनात्मस्त्विति, but the MSS. clearly point to उत्तमस्त्विति.

P. 106. l. 2. (IX. 58, 3.) The extract added at the end of Sâyaṇa's commentary is taken from the Śâtyâyana-Brâhmaṇa. The only passage I can find where the story of Taranta and Purumîlha is given, is in the Tândya-Brâhmaṇa, XIII. 7. Here we read अस्मे वै पुरुषंती तरंतपुरुमीढाभ्यां वैददश्विभ्यां सहस्राण्यदित्सतां (this in MS. Wils. 373 corrected in the margin into अदिहतां) तावैस्तेतां कथं नाविदमात्मप्रतिगृहीतं स्यादिति तौ प्रत्येतां अस्मयोः पुरुषंतीरा सहस्राणि दहहे तरत्स मंदी धावतीति ततो वैतत्तयोरात्मप्रतिगृहीतमभवदात्मस्याप्रतिगृहीतं भवति य एवं वेद ॥ This Sâyaṇa explains: अस्मे शतूणां स्पर्धयिष्यौ (sic) पुरुषंती एतत्संज्ञे । लिंगव्याययः । एतत्संज्ञौ राजानौ वैददश्विभ्यां विददश्वगोदाभ्यां तरंतपुरुमीढाभ्यामृषिभ्यां सहस्राणि सहस्रसंख्याकानि अदिहताः (for अदित्सतां) दातुमैच्छतां । ततस्तावृषी ऐक्षेतां च ईक्ष्यं पर्यालोचनमकुर्वतां । नावावयोर्दिदं धनमात्रं स्वीकृतं कथं केन प्रकारेणाप्रतिगृहीतं स्यात् । प्रतिग्रहदोषविमुक्तं भवेदिति । ततस्तौ प्रत्येतां । अजानीतां । अस्मयोः पुरुषंतीरेति मंत्रमपश्यतामित्यर्थः । ततोऽनंतरं मंत्रप्रभावात्तत्त्वोक्तं तयोस्तद्धनमप्रतिगृहीतं प्रतिग्रहदोषविमुक्तमभवत् । अथैतद्वेदनं प्रशंसति । आत्मस्याप्रतिगृहीतं भवति य एवं वेदेति ॥ This throws sufficient light on the passage from the Śâtyâyana, as quoted by Sâyaṇa. The passage is, as usual, very incorrectly copied by the writers of the different MSS. The A. MSS. and Ca. share in a common lacuna, leaving out all between तरंतपुरुमीढौ and तरंतपुरुमीढौ. This omission must therefore have taken place before the A. class branched off from the Ca. MS., while the B. class, which stands by itself, unaffected by this early blunder, must have branched off before this accident happened.

P. 106. l. 10. (IX. 58, 4.) त्रिंशतं त्रीणि शतानि ॥ त्रिंशतं शतानि A. B 4. C. Mill. Ca. त्रिंशतं त्रिंशतानि B 1. Sâyaṇa mistook त्रिंशतं, thirty, for त्रिंशतं, three hundred; the various readings clearly point to त्रीणि शतानि.

P. 106. l. 22. (IX. 59, 1.) रमणीयं धनं B 4. रमणी धनं A. Ca. मणीयं धनं B 1.

P. 107. l. 1. (IX. 59, 2.) अदाभ्यो ॥ This was probably inserted from the margin, but in a wrong place. In a fragment of Sâyaṇa's commentary in my possession, अदाभ्यो is left out, and the commentary reads वसतीवरीभ्योऽशुभ्यश्च ।

P. 107. l. 13. (IX. 59, 4.) विश्वानेव ॥ Before विश्वानेव the words of the text, विश्वानिन्, are omitted.

P. 107. l. 17. (IX. 60, 1.) पुरजिष्णिगाद्यद्वादशका द्वादका ॥ °गाद्यो द्वादशको द्वादकौ A. Ca. B 4. °द्वादका: B 1. The correction is taken from VIII. 70, where, however, we ought to read त्वयोदशयुष्णिक् चतुर्दशयुष्णं पंचदशी पुरजिष्णिगाद्यद्वादशका द्वादका.

P. 107. l. 23. (IX. 60, 1.) नामधेयेन A. Ca. नामधेयेन B 4. नामकेन B 1.

P. 111. l. 2. (IX. 61, 10.) On the loss of the Visarga in भूम्मा ददे see Prāṭisākhya, Sūtra 259, 4.

P. 112. l. 3. (IX. 61, 14.) Sāyana separated सं from शिष्टरीःइव. I preferred चङ्गपयस्ताः to अवङ्गपयस्ताः, taking it in the sense of “full of milk, wishing to be relieved of their milk.” अवङ्गपयस्ताः, however, might be interpreted as “with unrestrained milk.”

P. 112. ll. 14 and 15. (IX. 61, 16.) Read वैश्चानरं in Sanhitā and Pada text instead of विश्वानरं; also in the commentary.

P. 113. l. 21. (IX. 61, 21.) The following extract may serve as a fair specimen of the state of the B. MSS.: हे सोम त्वं सूमस्यभिः शोभनोपस्याभिः धेनुभिर्गोविकारैः पयोभिरित्यर्थः । संमिक्षिताः शोभन यथा धेनुः शीघ्रमागो स्थानमासीदति तवद्योनि स्वकीयं स्थानं ॥ आसीदन् ॥ न इदानीमरुषः आत्ने चमानो भव ॥ B 1. One can hardly believe that this was written *bona fide*, and it is easy to imagine what would become of a second or third copy carelessly taken from such an original.

P. 114. l. 1. (IX. 61, 22.) निरुधानं B 4. निधानं A. Ca. निरुधं B 1.

P. 114. l. 9. (IX. 61, 23.) The words from हे मीदुः to पूयमानस्त्वं are in all the MSS. placed before सुवीरासः.

P. 114. l. 15. (IX. 61, 24.) प्रवृद्धो ॥ प्रवृद्धो A. Ca. B 4. प्रवृधो B 1.

P. 115. l. 23. (IX. 61, 30.) धूर्वणे B 1. 4. तूर्वणे A. Ca.

P. 119. l. 21. (IX. 62, 17.) यातवे ॥ All between यातवे and the beginning of the next verse is omitted in A. It is found in B 4 and Ca.; also in B 1.

P. 120. l. 21. (IX. 62, 21.) मधुमंतं from B 1; A. and B 4 and Ca. have मधुभृतं. B 1 has देवार्चं instead of इंद्राद्यर्चं, and प्रक्षिपति (sic) instead of साधयत.

P. 120. l. 22. (IX. 62, 22.) It is curious that the A. MSS. (A. C. Mill, B 4) and Ca. have the common mistake अथ द्वादशी. In Ca. the passage was omitted, but added on the margin.

P. 121. l. 11. (IX. 62, 24.) श्रोतव्यानि A. Ca. B 4. स्तोतव्यानि B 1. The reading of B 1 seems preferable, but that of the other MSS. is admissible.

P. 123. l. 20. (IX. 63, 4.) Sāyana seems to have read अभि instead of अति.

P. 124. l. 18. (IX. 63, 8.) एतग्वा एतश A. Ca. B 4. एतग्व एतश B 1. See Yāska, Naigh. s. v.

P. 126. l. 12. (IX. 63, 16.) ते before तव should be left out.

P. 126. l. 16. (IX. 63, 17.) The Pada writes ईमिति, and does so always where the final Anusvāra is to be dropt. Otherwise it is ई. The cases in which Anusvāra is dropt, are enumerated in the Prāṭisākhya, Sūtra 302.

P. 127. l. 10. (IX. 63, 20.) Read माजैर्यति; and P. 128. l. 4. read अप्प.

P. 128. l. 7. (IX. 63, 24.) क्षरसि B 1. नितरां पीडयसि रक्षसि A. Ca. B 4.

P. 128. l. 7. (IX. 63, 24.) राक्षसवर्णं B 1. राक्षसवर्णं नै A. राक्षसवर्णं नै Ca. राक्षसवर्णं B 4.

P. 128. l. 13. (IX. 63, 25.) ऋत्विग्भिः B 4. ऋत्विग्भिः । त्विग्भिः A. Ca.; deest in B 1.

P. 130. l. 7. (IX. 64, 2.) वनं तव भजन B 1. वनं तव जन A. B 4. वनं तव मं भं जन Ca.

P. 132. l. 14. (IX. 64, 11.) देवाकीर्देव A. Ca. B 1. 4. One expects देवकाम.

P. 136. l. 18. (IX. 64, 29.) बलवान् A. Ca. B 4. वेजनवान् B 1.

P. 138. l. 20. (IX. 65, 4.) The commentary is given according to A. and B 4, with which Ca. agrees, though in it the whole commentary was left out and was supplied in the margin. The B. MSS. have supplied a fuller commentary. They begin with हे सोम त्वं वृषाभिमतफलानां वर्षितासि हि । भवसि खलु । तस्मात् हे पवमान पूयमान पुनान वा etc. After सुकर्मणः they add सुष्ठु ध्यानवतो वा. Instead of रश्मिना they have तेजसा, which is the more usual explanation. They then continue दीप्तिमंतं । अतिशयेन तेजस्वि-  
नमित्यर्थः । सुत्तिमंतं वा त्वा त्वां हवामहे । यज्ञेषु आह्वामहे ॥

P. 138. l. 26. (IX. 65, 5.) धनुषा° B 1. दुनुषा A. Ca. B 4. pr. man. (य sec. man.)

P. 139. l. 9. (IX. 65, 6.) वभसति ॥ All the MSS. read गभसति.

P. 139. l. 12. (IX. 65, 6.) पारिलवेन ॥ पारिलवेन A. पारिलवेन B 4; deest in Ca., but supplied sec. man. पारिलवेन; deest in B 1.

P. 143. l. 2. (IX. 65, 18.) अग्निपुत्रो भव त्वं । B 1. अग्निपुत्रो वा च Ca. A. B 4.

P. 144. l. 2. (IX. 65, 21.) दिक्ष्मन् ॥ दिक्ष्मन् A. Ca. दिक्ष्मन् B 4. sec. man. दिक्ष्मन् B 1. दिक्षः अस् C. Mill.

P. 146. l. 4. (IX. 65, 28.) बलमद्या । B 1. This is an important passage as it might be used to show the dependence of A. B 4. on Ca. Ca. has a blot which has destroyed the lower part of बल so as to make it look like तव, and this तव occurs in A. and B 4. (but not in C. Mill.) The same blot has nearly obliterated धन in the next line, and there is a lacuna in A. and B 4. (not in C. Mill.) The B. MSS. are not affected by this, but stand, as usual, independent of A. and Ca. But although in the ninth Maṇḍala the MSS. Ca. A. B 4 and C. Mill form one family, it would be difficult to admit in other passages that A. B 4 are dependent on Ca.

P. 146. l. 5. (IX. 65, 28.) संभजामहे is left out in Ca., likewise in A. and B 4 and C. Mill.

P. 147. l. 23. (IX. 66, 3.) After त्वदीयानि धामानि B 1 reads त्वद्भीना अहोरात्ररूपाः कालविशेषाः परि भवन्ति सर्वैत व्याप्तास्तिष्ठन्ति । यद्वा त्वदीयधामानि त्वद्भीना अहो तेजसां परि वर्तन्ते ॥ अत एव.

P. 151. l. 10. (IX. 66, 14.) त्वोतयः B 1. The other MSS. Ca. A. B 4. C. Mill have त्वेत्यः, evidently originally a wrong reading for त्वातयः, the old spelling of त्वोतयः, but liable to be read त्वेत्यः.

P. 153. l. 13. (IX. 66, 20.) देवमनुष्या गंधर्वाप्सरसः सर्पाः पितर इति Ca. A. B 4. (sec. man. देवाः.) देवमनुष्यगंधर्वाप्सरसः पितरो इति B 1.

P. 153. l. 17. (IX. 66, 20.) अग्नि गोभिर्गी° B 4. sec. man. अग्नि भिर्गी° Ca. A. अग्नि देवाभिर्गी° B 1.

P. 154. l. 6. (IX. 66, 22.) हिंसकान् B 1. C. Mill. पिदिसकान् Ca. पिदिसकान् A. पिदिसकान् B 4.

P. 155. l. 6. (IX. 66, 25.) पवित्रानिर्गच्छतीत्यर्थः ॥ पवित्रानिर्गच्छतीत्यर्थः A. Ca. B 4. C. Mill. पवित्र ता गार्गच्छतीत्यर्थः B 1.

P. 155. l. 11. (IX. 66, 26.) ईदृषिन् । C. Mill. ईदृषिन् A. Ca. ईदृषिन् B 1. इदृषेतर (sec. man.) B 4. Differently explained by Sāyana, Rv. I. 22, 2; 11, 1: cf. Prātisākhya, Sūtra 654, 3.

P. 156. l. 2. (IX. 66, 28.) कलशं प्रतिकर्षेण क्षरति ॥ कलशे प्रतिकर्षेण रक्षति A. Ca. कलशेण रक्षति C. Mill. In B 4. प्राक्षाः is changed into प्रोक्ष्ण; then follows कलशे प्रतिकर्षेण रक्षति. कलशं प्रतिकर्षेण क्षरति B 1. If pratikarsha is the right reading, it would here mean "attraction," a meaning not mentioned by B. R.

P. 156. l. 3. (IX. 66, 28.) अतोऽल्लतस्य. As all MSS. have this reading, I have left it, although in Pāṇini VII. 2, 2, it is अतो ल्लतस्य.

P. 156. l. 4. (IX. 66, 28.) After हस्त्यादिना तिलोपः all the MSS. add another explanation, which is meant to explain the omission of the Âgama it. This, however, was already explained as chāṇḍasa, and from the unfinished state of the sentence, the explanation seems to be a later addition that came into the text from the margin. Thus A. Ca. B 4 read अनित्यमागमशासनमिति सिच ३ आ 1. B 1 has the same, but ends with सिच ३ 1. C. Mill has सिच ३ आ न सिच ३ आ 1.

P. 156. l. 24. (IX. 67, 1.) In the introduction all the MSS. except B 1 omit the statement that the thirtieth verse is a Puraushṇih, and the twenty-seventh, thirty-first and thirty-second Anushtubh. B 1 adds अलाय्यस्तेषां त्रिंशी पुर उष्णिक् आद्या द्वादशका य षकवती (आद्यद्वादशकद्व्यष्टकवती?) सप्तविंशेकत्रिंशीद्वादत्रिंशयस्तिष्ठोऽनुष्टुभः शिष्टा गायत्र्यः । अविता नो etc.

P. 158. l. 12. (IX. 67, 4.) प्रभूतं, all MSS. except C. Mill, which leaves out something, and reads अवीनां स्वभूतानि गैच्छतीत्यर्थः 1.

P. 158. l. 13. (IX. 67, 4.) त्वया सहाहमिन्द्रमाह्वयामीत्यर्थः B 4. sec. man.; deest in B 1. A. Ca. have °ह्वयामीति वाजयाह्वयामीत्यर्थः. C. Mill has °ह्वयामीति वाजं मह्वयामीत्यर्थः 1.

P. 163. l. 8. (IX. 67, 21.) पूज्यमान A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4; पूयमान B 1 seems to have been the original reading.

P. 163. l. 18. (IX. 67, 23.) The quotation from Âśvalāyana is taken from the twelfth Kaṇḍikâ of the second book, to which there is no commentary. The MS. of the E. I. H. 1129 agrees on that point with the two MSS. of the commentary used by Râma Nârāyaṇa Vidyâratna in his edition of Âśvalāyana in the Bibliotheca Indica. The text of this section as printed by him in a note is not quite free from mistakes, and in the line here quoted पवित्रमर्चिषा should be पवित्रमर्चिषा.

P. 165. l. 9. (IX. 67, 28.) अस्मान् प्रकर्षेण वर्धय A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. आस्मानं प्रकर्षेण वद्धा B 1.

P. 167. l. 1. (IX. 67, 32.) यागादिपरं वेदशास्त्रविदं करोतीत्यर्थः ॥ यागादिपरवेदशास्त्रविदं A. Ca. B 4. यागादिपरं वेदशास्त्रविदं C. Mill. योगादिपरं वेदशास्त्रं B 1. Different emendations might be proposed; the one I have adopted is in accordance with Sāyana's style. वेदशा-

खाविदं is unusual with Sāyana, and in this place without a definite object. The MSS. represent here, as usual, two families only, A. Ca. B 4. C. Mill on one side, and B 1 on the other.

P. 167. 1. 3. (IX. 67, 32.) After the eighteenth Varga, the Sanhitā MSS. of the Rig-veda add a so-called Padaśiṣṭa, or Khila. It is wanting in S. 1. In S. 2 a lacuna begins after the leaf which contained the greater portion of the Khila. The other MSS. give the Khila with many variations in the arrangement of the verses. The accents are left out by some writers, by others they are added at random. I have given the text without attempting a critical restoration, which, without better MSS., would be impossible. Some of these verses occur in the Sāma-veda, beginning with II. 5, 2, 8, 3-6; others in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa I. 4, 8, 4-6.

अथ पदशिष्टं ॥ पावमानीः स्वस्वयनीः सुदुषा हि धृतश्रुतः<sup>1</sup> ।  
 क्षुधिभिः संभृतो रसो ब्राह्मणेष्वमृतं हितं ॥१॥  
 पावमानीर्दिशुं<sup>2</sup> न इमं लोकमथो अमुं ।  
 कामान्समर्धयंतु नो देवैर्देवीः समाहिताः<sup>3</sup> ॥२॥  
 येन देवाः पवित्रेणाम्नां पुनते सदा ।  
 तेन सहस्रधारेण पावमान्यः<sup>4</sup> पुनंतु मां<sup>5</sup> ॥३॥  
 प्राजापत्यं पवित्तं शतोद्यामं हिरण्यं ।  
 तेन ब्रह्मविदो वयं पूतं ब्रह्म पुनीमहे ॥४॥  
 इंद्रः सुनीती सह मा पुनातु सोमः स्वस्या वरुणः समीच्या ।  
 यमो राजा प्रमृषाभिः पुनातु मा जातवेदा मोर्जयंता पुनातु ॥५॥  
 क्षुधयस्तु तपस्तेषुः सर्वे स्वर्गैर्जिगीषवः ।  
 तपसस्तपसोऽग्नं तु पावमानीर्चुचोऽब्रवीत् ॥६॥  
 यन्मे गर्भे वसतः पापमुग्रं यज्जायमानस्य च किञ्चिदन्यत् ।  
 जातस्य च यच्चापि वर्धतो मे तत्पावमानीभिरहं पुनामि ॥७॥  
 मातापितृभ्यैन्न कृतं वचो मे यत्स्यावरं जंगममा बभूव ।  
 विश्वस्य तत्प्रहृषितं वचो मे तत्पावमानीभिरहं पुनामि ॥८॥  
 गोम्राक्षस्करत्वात्स्त्रीवधाद्यच्च किल्बिषं<sup>6</sup> ।  
 पापकं च चरणेष्वस्तत्पावमानीभिरहं पुनामि ॥९॥  
 ब्रह्मवधात्सुरापानात्स्वर्गैस्तेयाद्दृषलीगमनमैषुनसंगमात् ।  
 गुरोर्दाराभिगमनाच्च तत्पावमानीभिरहं पुनामि ॥१०॥  
 बालग्नान्मातृपितृवधाद्भूमितस्करात्सर्वैर्वाङ्गमनमैषुनसंगमात् ।  
 पापेभ्यश्च प्रतिग्रहात्सद्यः प्रहरति सर्वैर्दुष्कृतं तत्पावमानीभिरहं पुनामि ॥११॥  
 क्रयविक्रयाद्योनिदोषाद्ब्रह्माद्भोज्यात्मतिग्रहात् ।  
 असंभोजनाच्चापि नृशंसं तत्पावमानीभिरहं पुनामि ॥१२॥

<sup>1</sup> पयस्वतीः T. B.

<sup>2</sup> दधंतु S. V. दिशंतु T. B.

<sup>3</sup> समाहिताः S. V. समाभृताः T. B.

<sup>4</sup> पावमानीः S. V.

<sup>5</sup> नः S. V. मा T. B.

<sup>6</sup> The metre is frequently wrong, but might easily be

mended here by reading गोम्राक्षस्करत्वाच्च. In the next verses, too, the metre is corrupt.



दुर्यष्टे दुरधीतं पापं यच्चाज्ञानतोऽकृतं ।  
 अयाजिताश्चासंयाज्यास्तत्पावमानीभिरहं पुनामि ॥१३॥  
 अमंत्तमन्त्रं यत्किंचिद्भूयते च दुताशने ।  
 संवत्सरकृतं पापं तत्पावमानीभिरहं पुनामि ॥१४॥  
 कृतस्य योनयोऽमृतस्य धाम विश्वा देवेभ्यः पुण्यगंधाः ।  
 ता न आपः प्र वहंतु पापं शुद्धा गच्छामि सुकृतासु लोकं तत्पावमानीभिरहं पुनामि ॥१५॥  
 पावमानीः स्वस्वयनीर्याभिर्गच्छति<sup>१</sup> नांदनं ।  
 पुण्यांश्च भक्षान्भक्षयत्यमृतत्वं च गच्छति ॥१६॥  
 पावमानं पितृन्देवान्ध्यायेद्यश्च सरस्वतीं ।  
 चूर्षीस्तस्योपवर्ते तत्क्षीरं सर्पिर्मधूदकं ॥१७॥  
 पावमानं परं ब्रह्म शुक्रं ज्योतिः सनातनं ।  
 पितृस्तस्योपतिष्ठे तत्क्षीरं सर्पिर्मधूदकं ॥१८॥  
 पावमानं परं ब्रह्म ये पठन्ति मनीषिणः ।  
 सप्तजन्मा भवेद्विप्रो धनाढ्यो वेदपारगः ॥१९॥  
 दशोत्तरायुश्चैव पावमानीः शतानि षट् ।  
 एतज्जुह्वन्नपेन्मलं धोरं मृत्युभयं हरेत् ॥२०॥ इति पदशिष्टं समानं ॥

P. 167. l. 4. (IX. 67, 32.) दाशतय्या A. Ca. B 4. C. Mill. दशतय्या B 1.

P. 168. l. 8. (IX. 68, 2.) शरेण A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. शस्त्रेण B 1.

P. 171. l. 12. (IX. 68, 8.) All MSS. except B 1 have a lacuna at the end of the commentary from इयति to इयति in verse 9. A. has वाचमियति अभिप्राययति । किंच पुनानः. Ca. C. Mill, and B 4 have the same, only that in B 4 the omission was observed, and नवमी written on the margin. If it had not been for B 1 (and its copies B 2. 3) it would have been impossible to restore the omission. B 1 reads वाचमियति प्रेरयति तदा हि स्तोतारः स्तुवंति । उच्यते । अथ नवमी ॥

P. 172. l. 24. (IX. 69, 1.) After व्रतेष्वपि A. Ca. C. Mill have यद्वोप च, B 4. यद्वोप वा, B 1. द्वोपव.

P. 173. l. 3. (IX. 69, 2.) The MSS. of the text write मधुमां द्रुषः, i. e. मधुमान्द्रुषः; S. 2. मधुमा; S. 4. (MS. meum) मधुमौ.

P. 173. l. 22. (IX. 69, 2.) ओषधीनामग्रे Ca. ओषधीनामग्ने B 1. ओषधीनाग्नौ A. B 4, न in marg. ओषधीनाग्नौ C. Mill.

P. 174. l. 21. (IX. 69, 4.) अयणद्रुष्यं ॥ अयणद्रुष्यं A. Ca. अयणद्रुष्यं C. Mill. आपणद्रुष्यं B 4. अयणयद्रुष्यं B 1.

P. 176. l. 19. (IX. 69, 8.) अंगिरसामपि पितासि B 1. अंगिरसामधिपतिरसि A. Ca. B 4. C. Mill.

P. 177. l. 20. (IX. 69, 10.) बाधकानामसिता ॥ Cf. Rv. I. 64, 5.

P. 177. l. 22. (IX. 69, 10.) पवमाने ॥ पवमाने न परि ते A. Ca. यमाने परि ते B 1. Cf. Rv. I. 31, 8.

P. 178. l. 25. (IX. 70, 2.) वरणार्थं ॥ वरणार्थं A. B 1.

P. 183. l. 27. (IX. 71, 1.) किंच । अयं सोमः ॥ किंच । यं सोमं A. B 1.

P. 187. l. 9. (IX. 71, 8.) सोमस्य स्वभूतो वर्णः ॥ सोमस्य स्वभूतो वर्णः B 1. सोमस्य भु - - - तो वर्णः B 4. सोम स्व भु - - - तो वर्णः A. Ca. सोम स्वभू - - - तो वर्णः C. Mill.

P. 192. l. 3. (IX. 72, 8.) ग्रहात् त्रिभि ॥ ग्रहो त्रिभि A. Ca. B 1. 4. C. Mill. Cf. Vāj. S. VIII. 47 and 48.

P. 192. l. 5. (IX. 72, 8.) After मा निर्भाक्षीः B 1 adds स्वा नियोक्षीः, i. e. मा वियोक्षीः.

P. 192. l. 6. (IX. 72, 8.) कीदृशात् । सदनस्पृशः । येन भूतेन वसुना सदनानि गृहान् पुत्रादीन् स्पृशंति तादृशात् गृहादिकस्य प्रदातुर्यन्त्राणां वियुजः ॥ A. कीदृशान् । सदनस्पृशान् । ये भूतेन वसुना सदनानि गृहान् पुत्रादीन् स्पृशंति तादृशाद्गृहादिकस्य प्रदातुर्यन्त्राणां वियुजः प भाक् । B 1. कीदृशान् सदनस्पृशः ॥ यत् येन वसुना सदनानि गृहान् पुत्रादीन् स्पृशंति तादृशाद्गृहादिकस्य प्रदातुर्यन्त्राणां वियुजः भाक्. B 4. कीदृशान् सदनस्पृशः ये भूतेन वसुना सदनानि ग्रहान् पुत्रादीन् स्पृश तादृशान् गृहादिकस्य प्रदातुर्यन्त्राणां वियुजः प भाह. Ca. कीदृशान् । सदनस्पृशः । ये भूतेन वसुना सदनानि गृहान् पुत्रादीन् स्पृश तादृशात् गृहादिकस्य प्रदातुर्यन्त्राणां वियुजः पं भाक् ॥ C. Mill कीदृशान् । सादनस्पृशः येन भूतेन वसुना सदनानि गृहान् पुत्रादीन् स्पृशतादृशात् गृहादिकस्य प्रदातुर्यन्त्राणां वियुजः पं भाक्.

P. 193. l. 6. (IX. 73, 1.) After हनुरुच्यते B 1 has a quotation which is wanting in all the other MSS.; हनु अघिषण इत्याश्रानात् (sic).

P. 193. l. 7. (IX. 73, 1.) After समस्वरन् संगच्छंते all the MSS., except B 1, which has a lacuna, read तदस्य शब्दयनवा, which I have altered by conjecture into तदास्यशब्दयनवा.

P. 193. l. 10. (IX. 73, 1.) प्रीयनात् A. Ca. B 1. 4.

P. 194. l. 1. (IX. 73, 2.) धाम च B 4. sec. man. धामनिव A. Ca. B 1. C. Mill.

P. 196. l. 13. (IX. 73, 7.) गोपया A. B 4. Ca. C. Mill. गोपाया B 1. See Ait. Brāhm. I. 27.

P. 196. l. 16. (IX. 73, 7.) मध्यमवाचः पुत्रा मरुतः स्पृशो वाचा वशिन्नो भवन्ति । This is merely a conjectural reading. The MSS. give the following readings: मध्यमवाचा प्र प्र मरुते शसः वाचा वशिन्नो भवन्ति A. Ca. C. Mill; मध्यमवाचा प्र प्र सह ते शसः वाचा वशिन्नो भवन्ति B 4; मध्यमवाचा प्र प्रे मरुतो शसः वाचा वशिन्नो भवन्ति B 1.

P. 198. l. 9. (IX. 74, 1.) पृथुतरं A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. पृथुतमं B 1.

P. 198. l. 23. (IX. 74, 2.) गतेर्निघातः ॥ गच्छते निघातः A. गच्छते निघातः Ca. C. Mill. गच्छतेर्निघातः B 4. गते विघातः B 1.

P. 199. l. 9. (IX. 74, 3.) इंद्रः शतसहस्रसंख्याकहरिभिः सह गंतु मार्गो विस्तीर्णो भवेदित्यर्थः B 1. इंद्रः शतसहस्रसंख्याके हरिभिः सह गंतु मार्गो विस्तीर्णो भवेदित्यर्थः A. Ca. C. Mill; also B 4, except मार्गे.

P. 200. l. 2. (IX. 74, 4.) मापोरिखे रुन्ति ॥ मापोरिखे रुन्ति A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. मागोरिखे रुन्ति B 1. This is evidently a quotation of an Unādi-sūtra, which, however, does not occur in our editions. In the Unādi-sūtras IV. 101, peru is derived by mipibhyām ruh. In I. 35, an ākṛitigaṇa is quoted in which peru occurs. But in our passage peru and meru are evidently derived from the roots mā and pā, and the vowel is changed to i before run. I can find no trace of this Sūtra, and I therefore can give the reading इत्थे only as conjectural.

P. 200. l. 25. (IX. 74, 6.) नाभो नभसो वाधिका । The passage is evidently corrupt, and though it is easy to propose conjectural emendations, nothing is gained by them without the aid of better MSS. The MSS. read as follows: नाभा तपसो A. Ca. ;

नामः तपसो C. Mill; नभो तपसो B 4. All these point to नामः नभसो, Sandhi being either observed or disregarded by the copyist. B 1 reads नामः नमसो, which again can only be meant for नामः नभसो. But why should नामः be explained by नभसो बाधिकाः? If Sāyana derived नामः, which does not occur again, from नह्, like नाभिः, he would have explained it by वंधकाः, and this was probably the original reading.

P. 202. l. 23. (IX. 75, 1.) चायतेरमुनि चन इति A. B 4. Ca. C. Mill. चायतेरमुनि च इति B 1. Both readings differ considerably from Upādi-sūtra IV. 199, चायतेरन्ने हस्त्रश्च.

P. 205. l. 2. (IX. 75, 5.) वचनवंतः. This is the reading of all the MSS. of Sāyana, also of the Nirukta MSS. which I could consult. Prof. Roth (Nir. IV. 15) reads वचनवंतः.

P. 208. l. 21. (IX. 77, 2.) किं । रजः ॥ किंच रजः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4.

P. 210. l. 4. (IX. 77, 5.) वृजिनेष्वरिष्टेषु 1. All the MSS. (A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4) have वृजिनेषु instead of वृजनेषु, which is the reading of the MSS. of the texts, with the accent on the second syllable. As Sāyana seems to have read वृजिनेषु I have left this reading, though it is clearly wrong.

P. 211. l. 17. (IX. 78, 3.) सेचनशीलं । A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. सेचनं शीलं B 4.

P. 213. l. 21. (IX. 79, 3.) समरीत 1. As all MSS. except B 1 read समरीत्, Sāyana may, by mistake, have read समरीत् instead of समरीत. In B 1 we have a lacuna, सा यथा त प्राप्नोति, and one might suppose that a whole sentence had been dropt; सा यथा तान्प्राप्नोति तद्वत्सोमः शतून्समरीत. But this is impossible, as Sāyana begins by stating that he takes the second half as pratyaksha.

P. 215. l. 12. (IX. 80, 1.) वि दिद्युते B 1. दिवि द्युलोके A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4.

P. 218. l. 1. (IX. 81, 2.) सोमसज्जुषां ॥ सोमसज्जोषा A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4.

P. 225. l. 24. (IX. 84, 4.) पायुरेव । A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4. पायुभिरेव?

P. 227. l. 10. (IX. 85, 2.) संग्रामात् । A. Ca. B 1. 4; deest in C. Mill. संग्रामान्?

P. 230. l. 16. (IX. 85, 11.) उपाकृतं 1. Sāyana seems to have read उप । पृतिस्वांसं 1.

P. 231. l. 9. (IX. 86, 1.) आकृष्टा इति A. Ca. B 1. 4. आतुष्टा C. Mill.

P. 231. l. 10. (IX. 86, 1.) नीवावरो इति A. Ca. B 1. 4. C. Mill.

P. 231. l. 11. (IX. 86, 1.) पुन्नय इति A. Ca. B 1. 4. C. Mill.

P. 231. l. 12. (IX. 86, 1.) आकृष्टा माषा इति A. Ca. B 4. अकृष्टा B 1. आक्षष्टा C. Mill.

P. 231. l. 15. (IX. 86, 1.) आकृष्टा A. Ca. B 1. 4. आक्षष्टा C. Mill.

P. 231. l. 15. (IX. 86, 1.) पुन्नयो ॥ प्रन्नयो A. Ca. B 4. C. Mill. पुन्नये B 1.

P. 231. l. 16. (IX. 86, 1.) It is clear that Sāyana took तृतीये त्रयः for त्रयः, the three companies of Rishis mentioned before. Shadguruśishya takes it for अत्रयः. He writes चतुर्थे दशर्चे अत्रय इतिनामानः.

P. 236. l. 23. (IX. 86, 13.) अनूचान वा । ये वानूचानास्ते ॥ अनूचानवा ये वा अनूचानास्ते A. Ca. B 4. अनूचान वा ये वा अनूचानास्ते B 1. अनूचान वा ये वा अनूचानास्ते C. Mill.

P. 239. l. 26. (IX. 86, 20.) After इंद्रस्य A. Ca. C. Mill and B 4 add यजमानस्य.

P. 240. l. 9. (IX. 86, 21.) एकविंशति गा क्षत्रिगुमुखेन B 1. एकविंशति वारान् त्वक्षुखेन A. Ca.

एकविंशति चारात् त्वन्मुखेन B 4. एकविंशति वारात् त्व-खेन C. Mill. The readings in all the MSS. except B 1 are intended for एकविंशतिवारं.

P. 242. l. 16. (IX. 86, 26.) After कुर्वण इत्यर्थः B 1 adds यद्वा गाल्पकारिणि क्षीराणि कुर्वण इत्यर्थः 1.

P. 243. l. 3. (IX. 86, 27.) After गोभिः we expect पयोभिः or क्षीरेण; पृष्ठे, too, is left unexplained by Sāyana.

P. 243. l. 20. (IX. 86, 29.) वर्षसाधनोऽपां B 4. sec. man. वर्षसाधनां पां A. Ca. वर्षसाधनो पां C. Mill. समुद्रवर्षसाधनो नि B 1.

P. 244. l. 14. (IX. 86, 31.) अवचक्रदत् अवक्रंदत् ॥ अवचक्रदत् अवक्रंदत् B 1. अवचक्रदत् अवचक्रदत् A. अवचक्रदत् अवक्रंदत् Ca. अवचक्रदत् अवदं क्रंदत् C. Mill. अवचक्रदत् अवक्रंदत् B 4. क्रंदत् sec. man. Sāyana takes अवचक्रदत् as a participle, in spite of the accent.

P. 245. l. 10. (IX. 86, 33.) Sāyana leaves out पवते, and seems to have read नृभिः instead of हरिः 1.

P. 251. l. 16. (IX. 86, 48.) One expects यतः क्रतुविदतः स्तुत्य इत्यभिप्रायः 1.

After hymn IX. 86 (VII. 3, 21) some of the MSS. give the following Khila :

इत्थैव वामञ्जु<sup>1</sup> वस्तां घृतेन यस्याः पदे<sup>2</sup> पुनते देवपंतः ।

घृतपदी शङ्करी सोमपृष्ठोप<sup>3</sup> यज्ञमस्थित वैश्वदेवी ॥

वैश्वदेवी पुनती देव्या गाढस्वामिमा बह्वस्तन्वो वीतपृष्ठाः ।

तया मदंतः सधमादेष्टु<sup>4</sup> वयं स्याम पतयो रयीणां ॥ २२ ॥

The text is given from the MS. S. 3. W. is Wilson 438; deest in W. 432; deest in S. 1, S. 2; deest in P. S.

P. 252. l. 4. (IX. 87, 1.) After पूयमानो B 1 reads ऽभ्यर्षं वाजं संग्रामं वाजिनं etc.

P. 254. l. 21. (IX. 87, 8.) प्राप्तं तया प्राप्तव्यं ॥ पातं स्वया प्राप्तव्यं B 1. प्राप्तं स्वया प्राप्तव्यं A. Ca. B 4. प्राप्तं स्वयं प्राप्तव्यं C. Mill.

P. 256. l. 10. (IX. 88, 2.) विरोधात् ॥ विरोधाधीनि A. Ca. C. Mill. विरोधारत् B 1. विराधा-दीन B 4. sec. man.

P. 256. l. 19. (IX. 88, 3.) हवमाह्वानमाकर्ष्य A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4. हव आह्वानमाकर्ष्य?

P. 259. l. 5. (IX. 89, 1.) अक्षाः । व्याघ्रोपि । A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4.

P. 259. l. 6. (IX. 89, 1.) न्यसदत् । निषीदति. A great deal of the commentary is lost in all the MSS., there being no explanation of the last pāda. This has produced a confusion in the remaining commentary. A. has न्यसदत् । निषीद निषीदति निषीदति वा । The same reading is found in Ca. C. Mill, B 4. B 1 has न्यसदत् निषीदति वा.

P. 261. l. 9. (IX. 89, 7.) This verse is left unexplained in all the MSS.; the commentary of verse 6, too, is in an imperfect state. The explanation beginning with कर्त्तुणि षष्ठी can hardly be written by Sāyana; it was probably supplied by a later copyist. In C. Mill the lacuna begins in verse 4, and is carried on to nearly the end of IX. 90, 1.

P. 263. l. 20. (IX. 90, 6.) निष्कृष्य ॥ निष्कृष्य A. निष्कृष्य Ca. B 1. निष्कृष्य B 4; deest in C. Mill.

<sup>1</sup> इत्थैव वामनु W.

<sup>2</sup> पदेषु न W.

<sup>3</sup> पृष्ठो W.

<sup>4</sup> सद W.

I have written विमृष्य instead of विमृश्य, because विमृष्य explains the mistakes of the copyists better than विमृश्य ।

P. 263. l. 26. (IX. 90, 6.) All the MSS. read सायणार्थेण, except B 1, which has साचार्य; C. Mill has धुरंधरेणार्थविरचितं. Sāyaṇa is called Sāyaṇārya, see vol. IV. p. 641.

P. 264. l. 5. (IX. 91, 1.) Read चङ्.

P. 265. l. 13. (IX. 91, 13.) रोचतेरिदं रूपं । See Rv. Bh. vol. I. p. 891. l. 13.

P. 268. l. 2. (IX. 92, 2.) चमंति चम्बो ग्रहादयः । All the MSS. give this reading, but Sāyaṇa probably wrote चमंत्यतेति चम्बो ग्रहादयः; cf. Rv. IX. 93, 3, etc.

P. 268. l. 23. (IX. 92, 4.) स्वभूताः ॥ प्रभूताः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. स्वभूताः B 1.

P. 270. l. 22. (IX. 93, 2.) मातृभूताभिः । A. Ca. B 4. सातृभूताभिः C. Mill. सेक्तभिः B 1.

P. 271. l. 24. (IX. 93, 4.) विष्वग्देवयोश्च देरद्व्यञ्चतावप्रत्यये । This is the right reading of Pāṇini's Sūtra VI. 3, 92, which in former passages where it occurred I altered, according to Boehtlingk's edition, into विष्वग्देवयोश्च देरद्व्यञ्चतौ वप्रत्यये. This, however, is clearly wrong, for there is no such word as विष्वद्यक्, while विष्वद्यक् occurs Rv. VII. 25, 1. Professor Boehtlingk himself perceived that he ought not to have altered the text (see his notes to VI. 3, 92), and I regret that I was misled. The reading सञ्चतौ वप्रत्यये might be defended, but विष्वग्देवयोश्च is clearly wrong. See Siddhānta-kaumudī, ed. Tārānātha, vol. I. p. 179, note.

P. 273. l. 27. (IX. 94, 3.) सचो यत् । A. Ca. C. Mill. सचोदयत् B 1. 4.

P. 275. l. 24. (IX. 95, 2.) सविः करोति । The change of Visarga into ष (Pāṇ. VIII. 3, 41) is not observed by Sāyaṇa, and I did not like to alter his way of writing. Similar cases occur p. 402. l. 8; p. 458. l. 21, etc. In दुष्प Pāṇini's rule, as far as writing is concerned, seems almost universally disregarded.

P. 276. l. 5. (IX. 95, 3.) सभ्यासस्यावर्णश्च रेफादेशश्छांदसः ॥ उवर्णश्च रेफादेशश्छांदसः । A. Ca. B 4. नुवर्णः C. Mill. उवर्णस्त्रेफादेशश्छांदसः B 1. रेफादेशश्च would be better.

P. 280. l. 11. (IX. 96, 7.) मनस ईशिताः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4.

P. 281. l. 20. (IX. 96, 10.) परिरक्षकः B 1. परिरक्षः A. Ca. परोक्षकः B 4. परिकरक्षकः C. Mill.

P. 284. l. 2. (IX. 96, 15.) नियंतव्यो A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. यतु शक्यो B 1.

P. 284. l. 25. (IX. 96, 17.) शब्दोपेतः B 1. शब्दयितव्यः । A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4.

P. 290. l. 15. (IX. 97, 5.) बहुविधधारो A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. बहुधारोपेतः B 1.

P. 291. l. 11. (IX. 97, 7.) उच्चारयन् ॥ उद्धारयन् A. Ca. B 4. उद्धारयन् C. Mill; deest in B 1.

P. 292. l. 4. (IX. 97, 8.) घोषशब्दस्य पृ - दागूष ॥ घोषशब्दस्य पृ - दांगू A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. गोपशब्दस्य पृ - दांगू B 1.

P. 292. l. 24. (IX. 97, 10.) गमनशीलनीचीनाग्ररससंघातः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. गमनशीलनीचीनो यो रससंघातः B 1.

P. 297. l. 7. (IX. 97, 20.) सबद्धा इत्यर्थः ॥ अवधीत्यर्थः A. Ca. B 4. अवध्यात्यर्थः C. Mill. अवधा इत्यर्थः B 1.

P. 299. l. 14. (IX. 97, 25.) सहस्राः । Read सहस्रा.

P. 301. l. 9. (IX. 97, 29.) भजनसाधनं धनं ॥ धनं deest in MSS.

P. 302. l. 11. (IX. 97, 32.) Sâyaṇa seems to have read अग्नि पंचां.

P. 304. l. 8. (IX. 97, 36.) बहुधि ॥ बहुधियं MSS. The mistake of putting बहुधियं as an acc. neut. instead of बहुधि seems to be due to the copyists rather than to the author of the commentary (see my Sanskrit Grammar, § 226).

P. 305. l. 16. (IX. 97, 39.) अस्माकं । Read अस्मान् ।

P. 309. l. 2. (IX. 97, 47.) यंत्येति समना यज्ञाः B 1. वंत्येति सम यज्ञाः A. B 4. वंत्येने त्वेति सम यज्ञाः Ca. वंत्येति समनाः तेषु C. Mill.

P. 311. l. 4. (IX. 97, 52.) चातके ॥ चातके A. Ca. C. Mill. चत्वे त्वं B 1. चोतके B 4. See Sâyaṇa to VII. 44, 3. It might be चेतके, or चातके from चातयति नाशयति ।

P. 316. l. 11. (IX. 98, 6.) धारभिः । Read धाराभिः.

P. 326. l. 4. (IX. 101, 1.) पुरःस्थितजयस्य ॥ पुरःस्थितस्य जयस्य A. Ca. B 1. 4. पुरस्थितस्य C. Mill.

P. 330. l. 17. (IX. 101, 13.) विघ्नकारी आ । A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. In B 1. आ is left out.

P. 330. l. 18. (IX. 101, 13.) राधक° ॥ संसाधक° A. Ca. B 4. साधक° B 1; deest in C. Mill.

P. 330. l. 19. (IX. 101, 13.) अपराद्धं मखं ॥ अयगद्धमखं A. अयराद्धमखं Ca. अपराद्धमखं C. Mill. अयरोद्धमख B 4. अपराधं मखं CB. Lacuna in B 1.

P. 333. l. 1. (IX. 102, 3.) धारया आत्मीयया वि धारय । किंच A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. B 1. I have left the reading of the MSS., though I believe that the original reading was धारयात्मीयया धारया पृष्ठेषु. The insertion of विधारय, without any excuse for it, is not in Sâyaṇa's style. In the commentary to the Sâma-veda II. 3, 2, 18, 3, Sâyaṇa, as far as my MS. allows me to see, has no such insertion. The Sâma-veda has airayat, and the commentator says airayad airayeti pāṭhau.

P. 339. l. 10. (IX. 104, 5.) ऽस्मदादीनां ॥ अस्मदीनां A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. अस्मदादीनां B 4. sec. man.; अस्मदीयानां B 1.

P. 350. l. 1. (IX. 107, 7.) देवानां left out in all the MSS.

P. 353. l. 3. (IX. 107, 15.) The first बृहदृतं is explained in A. Ca. C. Mill as सत्यभूतं; by B 1 as सत्यभूतं; B 4 has तं, and changed it to तः ।

P. 359. l. 2. (IX. 108, 4.) एतन्नामकोऽंगिरा ॥ एतन्नामको गि द्वा न A. एतन्नामकोऽंगि द्वा Ca. एतन्नामकोऽंगि C. Mill. एतन्नामकाऽद्वा B 4. एतन्नामको गिरा B 1.

P. 364. l. 1. (IX. 109, 1.) Sâyaṇa calls the Agnis, the Rishis of this hymn, ईश्वरपुत्राः, and quotes their name from the Anukramanî as ऐश्वराः. The MS. of the Anukramanî (MS. E. I. H. 132) reads likewise ऐश्वर. The MS. of the Bodl. Library, however (Wilson 379), reads ऐश्वरयो द्वैपदं, and explains it by ऐश्वरयः । ईश्वरपुत्राः.

P. 369. l. 5. (IX. 109, 22.) श्रीणन् प्रेरयन् सोमोऽभिषूयते A. Ca. B 1. 4. श्रीणन् प्रेरयन् सोमो भिषू पश्यमानास C. Mill; see Rv. IX. 110, 5.

P. 370. l. 2. (IX. 110, 2.) महे महति समर्यराज्ये A. Ca. B 4; deest in C. Mill. महे महती समर्ये राज्ये B 1.

P. 372. l. 8. (IX. 110, 8.) निर्दुहंति B 1. हविर्दुहंति A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4.

P. 372. l. 12. (IX. 110, 9.) निःष्ठाः । The MSS. always write निष्ठाः; but in order to avoid uncertainty, I prefer to insert the Visarga.

P. 373. l. 8. (IX. 110, 11.) यज्ञवान् ॥ यज्ञमानः A. Ca. B 1. 4. यज्ञमानः C. Mill.

P. 376. l. 6. (IX. 112, 1.) अपरिस्त्रवतः सोमस्याजामित्राय °दत्तं A. Ca. B 4, but न्वाय corrected to त्वाय. अपरिस्त्रवतः । सोमस्या जामि त्वाय - दत्तं C. Mill. अपरिस्त्रवतः सोमस्याजामित्राय मनसो विनो-  
दकं B 1. Read अजामित्राय, and compare Taittiriya-Sanhitâ II. 6, 10, 5, and Nyâya-  
mâlâvistara II. 4, 11 and 12.

P. 377. l. 12. (IX. 112, 3.) जसः शसादेशः ॥ जसो कारदेशः A. Ca. जस्याकाशादेशः । C. Mill.  
कारदेशः B 4. (marg. ज स जो); deest in B 1.

P. 377. l. 15. (IX. 112, 3.) After पूर्विका A. adds व्यापारण, Ca. C. Mill and B 4. व्यापारणा;  
B 1 has a lacuna.

P. 377. l. 26. (IX. 112, 4.) नर्मसचिवा ॥ नर्मशचिवा A. Ca. B 4. नर्मसचिवाः Ca. नमशापिच B 1.

P. 378. l. 23. (IX. 113, 2.) सत्यतयोरत्यो भेदो ॥ सत्यतयोरत्यो भेदो A. Ca. B 4. सत्यतयोरत्य  
भेदो C. Mill. सत्यतयोरत्यो भेदो B 1.

P. 379. l. 19. (IX. 113, 4.) आत्मनोपेक्षितां A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4; deest in B 1. CB.

P. 380. l. 17. (IX. 113, 7.) The Sanhitâ MSS. (S. 1. 3. S. meum) write यस्मिन्लोके; S. 2  
has यस्मिं लोके, both meant for nasalised l, as required by the Prâtisâkhya, Sûtra 227.

P. 384. l. 11. (IX. 114, 4.) अभिरक्षितानस्मान् A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4.

After hymn IX. 114 (VII. 5, 28), at the end of the ninth Maṇḍala, some MSS.  
give the following Khila:

यत् तत्परमं पदं विष्णोर्लोके महीयते<sup>1</sup> ।

देवैः सुकृतकर्मभिस्तत्<sup>2</sup> मा° ॥१॥

यत् तत्परममायं<sup>3</sup> भूतानामधिपतिं<sup>4</sup> ।

भावं भावि च योगींश्च<sup>5</sup> तत् माम्° ॥२॥

यत् लोकास्तूत्यजाः<sup>6</sup> श्रद्धया तपसा जिताः ।

तेजश्च यत् ब्रह्म<sup>7</sup> च तत् मा° ॥३॥

यत् देवा महांत्मानः<sup>8</sup> सेंद्राश्च समरुद्धाः<sup>9</sup> ।

ब्रह्म<sup>10</sup> च यत् विष्णुश्च तत्° ॥४॥

यत् गंगा च यमुना यत्<sup>11</sup> प्राची सरस्वती<sup>12</sup> ।

यत्<sup>13</sup> सोमेश्वरो देवस्तत् माम्° ॥५॥ २६॥

य इंदोः पर्वमानस्यानु<sup>14</sup> धामान्यक्रमोत्<sup>15</sup> ।

तमाहुः<sup>16</sup> सुप्रजा इति यस्ते सोमाविधुन्मन्ऽइंद्रा° ॥६॥

<sup>1</sup> हीयते S. I. 2. P. S.

<sup>2</sup> देवैस्तु कृतकर्मभिः स्तत् S. 2. कृतकर्मभिस्तत् P. S.

<sup>3</sup> परमायं W.

परमायं S. I. मायं P. S. S. 2.

<sup>4</sup> पतिः W. देवानामधिपतिं S. 2. नामधिपतिः P. S.

<sup>5</sup> भावभावी S. I.

भावभावी च योगी च P. S. भावभावि S. 2.

<sup>6</sup> यत् लोकाः S. I.

<sup>7</sup> ब्रह्मा S. I. P. S.

<sup>8</sup> हा S. I.

<sup>9</sup> सेंद्राश्च म S. I. त्मानः सेंद्राश्च म P. S.

<sup>10</sup> ब्रह्मा S. I. ब्रह्मा P. S.

<sup>11</sup> गंगा यमुना W. यमुना च S. I.

च यमुना च यत् S. 2. यमुना च P. S.

<sup>12</sup> प्राची सरस्वती S. 2.

<sup>13</sup> तत् W.

<sup>14</sup> नस्यानु S. I. 2.

<sup>15</sup> न्यक्र S. I. 2.

<sup>16</sup> हुः S. 2.

च॒पे म॑त॒कृतां॑ सोमैः क॒श्यपो॑द्ध॒र्धय॑न्ति॒रः ।  
 सोमं॑ नमस्य॒ राजानं॑ यो ज॒ज्ञे वी॒रुथां॑ पति॒रिद्रा॑° ॥७॥  
 स॒म दि॒शो ना॒ना सूर्याः॑ स॒म होता॑र॒ चृत्विजः॑ ।  
 दे॒वा आ॑दि॒त्या ये स॒म तेभिः॑ सोमा॒भि र॑ख न॒ इ॒द्रा° ॥८॥  
 यत्ने॑ राज॒ञ्चुतं॑ ह॒विस्तेन॑ सोमा॒भि र॑ख नः ।  
 अ॒राती॒वा मा न॑स्ता॒रीन्मोचं॑ नः किञ्च॒ नाम॑म॒दिद्रा॑° ॥९॥२९॥

The text is given from the Sanhitā MS. S. 3. W. 438 has only verses 1, 2, 5, and gives no accents. S. 1 places v. 2 after v. 4. P. S. places v. 4 before v. 3, and leaves out vv. 6-9. Deest in W. 432. S. 2 gives vv. 6, 7, 8, 9, 5, 1, 2.

## Māṇḍala X.

P. 385. l. 7. (X. 1, 1.) सह॒स्राव॑ममो॒देतोः॑ ॥ सह॒स्राव॑ममो॒देतोः॑ । A. सह॒स्राव॑ममो॒देतोः॑ Ca. C. Mill, B 4. सह॒स्राव॑ममो॒देतोः॑ B 1. 2. CB. Prof. Goldstücker suggested to me सह॒स्राव॑मन्मो॒देतोः॑, i. e. आ॒ उ॒देतोः॑ । The quotation is taken, as Prof. Aufrecht just informs me, from Āśv. VI. 5. सह॒स्राव॑मन् seems to mean "consisting of at least one thousand verses;" मो॒देतोः॑ is उ॒दया॒ग्राक्.

P. 388. l. 1. (X. 1, 5.) अ॒ग्नये॑र्धं C. Mill. अ॒ग्नये॑र्धं A. Ca. B 1. 2. 4. CB.

P. 389. l. 10. (X. 2, 1.) After अ॒ग्नं B 1. 2. CB. add ह॒वीषि॑ चा॒ग्नं; deest in A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4.

P. 391. l. 11. (X. 2, 5.) स॒तत॑या॒निजि॑तेन A. Ca. स॒तत॑या॒नि जि॑तेन B 4. स॒तत॑या॒चितेन॑ C. Mill. स॒तत॑या॒निजि॑तेन B 1. 2. CB. after दी॒नद॒द्याः.

P. 391. l. 12. (X. 2, 5.) पा॒क्तेन॑ B 1. 2. CB. पो॒षक्तेन॑ A. Ca. B 4. C. Mill.

P. 392. l. 14. (X. 2, 7.) दी॒प्यसे॑ A. Ca. B. C. Mill.

P. 394. l. 19. (X. 3, 5.) शो॒भन॑दी॒र्भेर्वा॑ A. Ca. B 1. 2. 4. CB. Another explanation of सु॒दि॒वः must have been omitted by the earliest copyists; ibid. l. 12. read तस्मि॑न्धि॒°.

P. 395. l. 14. (X. 3, 7.) महि॑ महान् । A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. महि॑ महतो B 1. 2. CB.

P. 399. l. 17. (X. 5, 1.) मनो॑ - मनु॒ष्यस्य॑ A. Ca. C. Mill. मनो॑ - मनु॒ष्यं B 4. हु॒ततो॑ - मनु॒ष्याणां॑ B 1. 2. CB.

P. 401. l. 18. (X. 5, 5.) स्व॒तेज॑सा A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. स्व॒यमे॒व B 1. 2. CB.

P. 402. l. 6. (X. 5, 6.) The first enumeration of the seven forbidden things is taken from Manu VII. 50 and 51. After enumerating eight sins which spring from kâma (kâmaja), and eight which spring from krodha (krodhaja, left out in B. R. Dictionary), Manu selects four of the former and three of the latter, as the seven most dangerous. Daṇḍa stands for daṇḍasya pātanaṁ or daṇḍa-pârushyam, whereas pârushyam is more specially meant for vâk-pârushyam. Instead of anyadûshaṇa, Manu reads twice arthadûshaṇam, i. e. arthânâṁ apaharaṇam, deyaṇâṁ adâṇam ca. Sâyaṇa, no doubt, intended to write arthadûshaṇam, but the MSS. agree on anyadûshaṇam or annadûshaṇam. The



second enumeration is taken from the Nirukta VI. 27. स्तयं instead of स्तेयं is in A. Ca. B 4; but B 1. 2. CB. had originally the right reading स्तेयं.

P. 402. l. 22. (X. 5, 6.) ज्ञानसहिते A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. ज्ञाने सति B 1. 2. CB.

P. 404. l. 8. (X. 6, 2.) सत्यवाक्यवान् A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. सत्यवानुदकवान् B 1. 2. CB., which is better, and should be inserted in the text.

P. 404. l. 13. (X. 6, 2.) सदासर्पण B 1. CB. सदा सर्पण A. Ca. B 4. सदा सर्पण C. Mill. सप्त सर्पण B 2.

P. 405. l. 6. (X. 6, 4.) वृषो वर्धितो B 1. 2. CB. वृषः पंडितो A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4.

P. 405. l. 6. (X. 6, 4.) हविलेक्ष्यैः B 1. 2. CB. हविषुक्तैः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4.

P. 407. l. 9. (X. 7, 2.) स्तोत्रमुखादुत्पन्नाः । B 1. 2. CB. स्तोत्रमुवोचत् । उत्पन्नाः A. Ca. B 4. स्तोत्रमुवोचत् । उत्पन्नाः C. Mill.

P. 408. l. 22. (X. 7, 6.) Read निरूपितवतः.

P. 409. l. 13. (X. 7, 7.) It may be अविता दृष्टभयेभ्यः, in opposition to गोपा अदृष्टभयेभ्यः.

P. 410. l. 15. (X. 8, 2.) उद्यमान्यु° as neuter, A. Ca. C. Mill, CB.; deest in B 1. उद्यमान् B 4. sec. man.

P. 410. l. 25. (X. 8, 3.) आङ् ईषदर्थे । आरम्भ । ईषद्विनस्ति । निर्मथनकालेऽपि ॥ आङ् । दर्धे आरम्भ ईषद्विनस्तिर्नियतकालेऽपि । A. Ca. आर डा वे । दर्धे आरम्भ ईषद्विनस्तिर्नियतकालेऽपि C. Mill. अगन् दर्धे आरम्भ ईषद्विनि स्तुर्नियतकालेऽपि B 4; deest in B 1. 2. अङ् प्रैषदर्धे आरम्भ ईषद्विनस्ति निर्मथन-कालेऽपि CB.

P. 411. l. 3. (X. 8, 3.) Read तन्वस्तदीया°.

P. 412. l. 3. (X. 8, 6.) आग्नेय्या उत्तरे नित्ये मूर्धन्वतः । आग्नेय्यामुत्तरेति ॥ त मूर्धन्वतः A. Ca. आग्ने-य्यामुत्तरेति । ते मूर्द्धं च C. Mill. आग्नेय्यामुत्तरेति ते मूर्धन्वतः B 4. आग्नेय्या उत्तरे नित्ये मूर्धन्वत B 1. 2. CB. आग्नेय्या उत्तरे ये उत्तरे इष्टी वस्त्येते मूर्धन्वते कामायेति च ते अग्निवत्ये भवत इत्यर्थः । पूर्वस्यामग्नेर्मूर्धन्वांगुणः । उत्तरस्यां कामो गुणः । नित्ये मूर्धन्वतः । अग्निर्मूर्धा भुवो यज्ञस्येत्यर्थः । Nārāyaṇa.

P. 414. l. 5. (X. 9, 1.) The words from ईशाना इति to प्रतिष्ठा, and again from पंचमी to प्रतिष्ठा were left out in all the MSS. and had to be supplied.

P. 416. l. 12. (X. 9, 9.) At the end of this hymn MS. S. 1. 2. 3. give the following Khila:

समुषीस्तदपसो दिवा नक्तं च समुषीः ।  
चरेण्यक्रतूरहमा देवीरवसे हुवे ॥

The Atharva-veda-sanhitā VI. 23, 1, as pointed out by Prof. Aufrecht, has the same verse, only reading चरेण्यक्रतुः instead of चरेण्यक्रतूः.

P. 417. l. 24. (X. 10, 2.) The end of the commentary is wanting in all the MSS.

P. 418. l. 11. (X. 10, 3.) Read गूहन°.

P. 420. l. 6. (X. 10, 7.) विश्वस्ता B 1. 2. CB. विश्वहा C. Mill. विश्वस्ता A. Ca. B 4.

P. 421. l. 4. (X. 10, 9.) After यमाय CB. alone of all MSS. inserts वहेतां ।

P. 421. l. 4. (X. 10, 9.) अजाम्यभ्रातरं CB. अजामि भ्रातरं A. Ca. B 4; deest in C. Mill; deest in B 1. 2.

P. 422. l. 26. (X. 10, 13.) Read परिष्वङ्गं.

P. 425. l. 8. (X. 11, 4.) यदायी अभिगमनीयं तं व्रजंतो ॥ यदा आर्याः सभिगमनीयतां व्रतंतो A. Ca. जनंतो C. Mill. यदा आर्याः अभिगमनीयतां वु तं तो B 4; deest in B 1. 2. अभिगमनीयतां व्रतंतो CB.

P. 425. l. 10. (X. 11, 4.) प्रतायत A. Ca. प्राज्ञायत C. Mill. प्रजायत B 4; deest in B 1. 2. प्रतीयत CB.

P. 426. l. 11. (X. 11, 6.) तुतुविषति । B 1. 2. This is meant by Sāyana for the desiderative of tu; but A. and Ca. C. Mill have तत्सेविषति; B 4 corrects this into तविष्यते; उत्सेवेषति CB.

P. 428. l. 1. (X. 11, 9.) यज्ञमप° B 1. 4. यज्ञामप° A. Ca. C. Mill, CB. यज्ञादप°?

P. 430. l. 3. (X. 12, 5.) देवान्छोको ॥ देवान्छोको S. 1. देवां छोको S. 2. देवांश्छोको S. 3.

P. 430. l. 19. (X. 12, 6.) The commentary to this verse is wanting in all the MSS. B 4 adds on the margin अत्र पतितो ग्रंथः १.

P. 431. l. 26. (X. 13, 1.) अंतरा वत्सैपादयोः is explained by दक्षिणस्य शकटस्य यदुत्तरं चक्रं तस्य यद्वर्त्म तस्यादयोर्मध्ये यथा भवति तथा यथादानसस्त्रिपदमात्रेऽतीते यो देशस्तत्र स्थित्वा etc. Nārāyaṇa.

P. 432. l. 8. (X. 13, 1.) पत्नीशालांति हविर्धानं प्रति युवां नयामीत्यर्थः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. पत्नीशालाद्विधेनं प्रति युवां नयामीत्यर्थः B 1. 2. CB. The verse in question is enjoined to be recited at the Havirdhānapravartana, which is the moving of the two sacrificial carts from the Prācīnavanśa to the Uttaravedi. We should therefore expect प्राचीनवंशादुत्तरवेदिं प्रति युवां नयामीत्यर्थः. Sāyana, however, clearly distinguishes between the śakaṭas and the havirdhāna, so that the former might be said to be brought near to the latter. In his commentary on Ait.-Br. I. 29, he says, तयोर्हविर्धानयोः प्राचीनवंशस्य पुरोभागमुपक्रम्योत्तरवेदिपश्चिमदेशपर्यंतं नयनं प्रवर्तनं १; and he explains the verse, हे हविर्धाने वां युवां ब्रह्म युजे । ब्राह्मणो युनक्तीत्येवं मन्त्रे यदुक्तेतत्पाठेन ब्राह्मणमुखेनैव हविर्धाने युक्ते भवतः पूर्वं देवैस्तथा कृतत्वादतश्चुक्तः.

P. 432. l. 24. (X. 13, 2.) प्रभरन् प्रभरंति ॥ प्रतरन् प्रतरंति A. Ca. B 4. पभरन् प्रतरंति CB. प्रतरन् प्रभरंति C. Mill. प्रभरन् प्ररुंति B 1. 2.

P. 433. l. 6. (X. 13, 3.) यष्टृणां B 1. 2. CB. शष्टृणां A. Ca. C. Mill. शकटानां B 4. sec. man.

P. 433. l. 6. (X. 13, 3.) धानासोम B 1. 2. CB. धना A. Ca. पथा C. Mill. इंधन B 4. sec. man.

P. 433. l. 8. (X. 13, 3.) अन्वरोहामि । शकटयोः ॥ आरोहामि शकटे युवयोः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. अन्वरोहामि शकटे युवयोः B 1. 2. CB. It may have been हे शकटे युवयोः.

P. 433. l. 8. (X. 13, 3.) करणं B 1. 2. CB. करणे A. Ca. B 4. करणै C. Mill.

P. 434. l. 8. (X. 13, 5.) सोमस्य पुत्रभूताः ॥ सोमस्य पितृभूताः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. CB.; deest in B 1. 2.

P. 434. l. 10. (X. 13, 5.) From देवजातस्य to च पुष्यतः the commentary is left out in all MSS. except CB. Ibid. l. 11. read ईशते.

P. 434. l. 17. (X. 14, 1.) सरमापुत्रौ यौ आनौ परलोकमार्गमभितः स्थितौ ॥ पुत्रौ द्वौ आनौ परलोकमार्गमभितस्थौ A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. CB.; deest in B 1. 2, which omit the whole commentary from 13, 4, to 14, 10.

P. 435. l. 5. (X. 14, 1.) अनुपस्यशानं । C. Mill. अनपस्यशानं A. Ca. B 4. CB.

P. 435. l. 13. (X. 14, 2.) निमित्तं विवेद । C. Mill. निमित्तं मा विवेद A. Ca. B 4. CB.

P. 435. l. 16. (X. 14, 2.) सर्वे खाः खभूताः पय्याः खकर्ममार्गभूता गतीरनु गच्छन्ति ॥ सर्वखाः खभूताः पय्याः खकर्ममार्गप्रतागताः अनु गच्छन्ति । A. Ca. CB. B 4. (but sec. man. प्रगताः.) सवखाः भूताः पय्याः खकर्ममार्गप्रमागताः अनु गच्छन्ति C. Mill.

P. 436. l. 1. (X. 14, 3.) The commentary to बृहस्पतिकृच्छ्रभिर्वावृधानः is left out in all the MSS.

P. 437. l. 11. (X. 14, 7.) सन्नमध्ये दीक्षितस्य मरणे ॥ तत्र मध्ये दीक्षितमध्ये मय्येपो । A. Ca. C. Mill. तत्र मध्ये दीक्षितमध्ये प्रेरय B 4. सन्नमध्ये दीक्षितमध्ये मय्येपो CB.

P. 438. l. 5. (X. 14, 8.) त्रियमानाख्यं A. Ca. B 4. त्रियमानाख्यं C. Mill.; deest in CB. The dental *n* shows that the mistake lies in त्रि, but I cannot amend it properly. It may be उमशानाख्यं, or it may refer to the same idea which is expressed in the *varia lectio* of the Taittiriya Âraṇyaka VI. 4, where we read यत् भूम्यै वृणसे तत् गच्छ.

P. 438. l. 9. (X. 14, 9.) गतौदेकेन A. Ca. B 4. CB.; deest in C. Mill. See M. M., Die Todtenbestattung bei den Brahmanen, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, vol. IX. p. iv. note 5.

P. 439. l. 7. (X. 14, 11.) Read दत्ता.

P. 441. l. 14. (X. 14, 16.) बृहत्सहस्रगद्यमश्च ॥ बृहत् महत् जंगमश्च A. Ca. B 4. CB. बृहदंगमाश्च B 1. 2. बृहत् जंगमश्च C. Mill. The commentary to Taitt. Âr. VI. 5, 11, affords no help.

P. 441. l. 16. (X. 14, 16.) अवस्थितानि । A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4. CB.

P. 443. l. 22. (X. 15, 4.) From श्रुतत्वाद्या begins a long lacuna in B 1, extending to the last verse of the hymn, where it continues again with नेतारं. The same lacuna exists in B 2. 3.

P. 444. l. 19. (X. 15, 6.) प्राचीनावीतिनः A. Ca. B 4. प्राचीनवीती CB. प्राचीरनावीतिनः C. Mill.

P. 445. l. 17. (X. 15, 8.) Read र आनुपूर्व्येण.

P. 446. l. 17. (X. 15, 10.) A. Ca. C. Mill and B 4 have कीदृशः and युक्ताः; CB. कीदृशः and युक्ताः. From पैरे the adjectives are to be referred to पितृभिः.

P. 447. l. 6. (X. 15, 11.) सुचि ॥ शुनि A. Ca. शुचीनी C. Mill. शुचि B 4. शब्दानि CB.

P. 449. l. 4. (X. 16, 1.) भस्मीभूतं । A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. भषीभूतं B 1. CB., i. e. like ink. In the commentary to Taitt. Âr. VI. 1. the same reading occurs, भषीरूपं.

P. 450. l. 2. (X. 16, 3.) The last portion of verse 3 is imperfectly explained. Sâyaṇa in explaining the same verse in Taitt. Âr. VI. 1, says: यत् यस्मिँश्चोके ते तव हितं सुखमस्ति तत् गत्वौषधीषु प्रविश्य तद्द्वारा पितृदेहमातृदेहौ प्रविश्य तत् तत्तोचि तानि शरीराणि स्वीकृत्य तैः शरीरैः प्रतिष्ठितो भव ॥

P. 450. l. 9. (X. 16, 4.) अंतरपुरुष° A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. CB. B 1. 2.

P. 450. l. 22. (X. 16, 5.) उदकादिभिः ॥ उदकाभिः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4, in marg. दि; उदकैः B 1. CB. Sâyaṇa, Taitt. Âr. VI. 4, has उदकादिभिः, and another MS. उदकाञ्जलिभिः.

P. 450. l. 24. (X. 16, 5.) Sâyaṇa, Taitt. Âr. VI. 4, explains शेषः by भोगं.

P. 451. l. 8. (X. 16, 6.) Sâyaṇa, Taitt. Âr. VI. 4, in explaining the same verse takes विश्वात् as an ablative of विश्वः, i. e. विश्वात् सर्वसाधुपट्टवात्.

P. 451. l. 24. (X. 16, 7.) विस्त्वारयति A. Ca. C. Mill. विस्तारयति B 1. विस्तारयति B 4. CB. Sāyana, Taitt. Ār. VI. 1, पर्यैखयातै परितो नैव चालयतु तवापसारणं मा करोतु 1.

P. 451. l. 26. (X. 16, 8.) The quotation from Āśvalāyana is omitted in the MSS.

P. 453. l. 19. (X. 16, 11.) Sāyana reads प्र वोचतु instead of प्र वोचति 1.

P. 453. l. 23. (X. 16, 12.) From अनवानन् ताः B 1. 2 leave out everything to X. 17, 6.

P. 454. l. 5. (X. 16, 12.) प्रज्ञं CB. प्रकृष्टं A. Ca. B 4. प्रज्ञं C. Mill.

P. 455. l. 15. (X. 17, 1.) आत्मसदृश्या. CB.; A. Ca. C. Mill, and B 4 have आत्मसदृशा; B 1 is missing. The following extract is from the Nītimañjarī (p. 68. a): सुखमिच्छता पुंसा भार्यानुरागेण स्यातव्यमित्यर्थ आह ॥ भर्तौ भार्यानुरागेण स्यातव्यं सुखमिच्छता । विवस्वान् हि तदाश्वोऽभूत्सरखूर्वडवा यदा ॥ अर्थो ह वा एष आत्मनो यज्जायेति शतपथे दृष्टत्वात् यत्नानुकूल्यं दंपत्योस्त्रिवर्गस्तत् वर्धत इति याज्ञवल्क्ये-नोक्तञ्चात्र यः शाश्वतिकं सुखमिच्छति तेन भर्तौ भरणशीलेन भार्यानुरागेण भार्यानुरूपेण स्यातव्यं । तच्च विवस्वतो दृष्टतेन दृढयति । हि यस्माद्यदा सरखूर्विवस्वद्वार्या वडवाश्चरूपिणी जाता तदा विवस्वानप्यश्वरूपो भूत्वा सुखमिच्छन् भार्यारूपोऽभवत् पश्चात्संभोगजं सुखं प्राप्तवान् तदनु रूपत्वान्नस्मात्तदनु रूपत्वेन भार्यासुखं प्राप्यत इत्युक्तं । तदर्थेयमुक् ॥ अपागूहन्नमृतां मर्त्यैः - सरखूः ॥ तत्तेतिहासः । त्वष्टृनामकस्य देवस्य सरखूस्त्रिशिपश्चेति स्त्रीपुंसान्कमपत्यद्वयमभूत् । ततस्त्वष्टा सरखूनामिकां पुत्रीं विवस्वते प्रायच्छत् । ततस्तस्यां विवस्वतः सकाशाद्यमयम्यौ जज्ञाते । ततः कदाचि-दात्मसदृश्या जनितायाः स्त्रियः समीपे तदपत्यद्वयं निधाय स्वयमाश्रयं रूपं कृत्वा स्वयमृत्तपान्कुरुन्मति जगाम । अथ विवस्वानेतां स्त्रियं सरखूमिति मत्वा तामरंसीत् । तस्यां मनुनीम राजर्षिरजायत । ततो विवस्वानेषा सरखून् भवतीति विज्ञाय स्वयमप्यश्वो भूत्वा तामश्चरूपिणीं प्रायासीत् । ततः संक्रीडमानयोस्तयो रेतः पृथिव्यां पपात । अथ सा गर्भकामा तत्पतितं रेत आजगौ । ततस्तस्याः सकाशादश्विनावजायेतामिति । तत्तेतिहासमाचक्षते त्वाष्ट्री सरखूरिति यास्केन सम्यगुक्तं । अभवन्मिथुनं त्वष्टुरिति बृहद्देवतोक्तं पूर्वमुक्तं ॥

The following extract from the Bṛihaddevatā was given me by Dr. Thibaut, who is preparing a critical edition of the whole work. He has divided the MSS. into two families: the one comprising B. b<sup>1</sup>. b<sup>2</sup>. all MSS. in my possession, and b<sup>3</sup>. a MS. lent me by Dr. Bühler; the other comprising h., a MS. lent by Dr. Hall to M. Regnier, H. a MS. given by Dr. Hall to the Bodleian Library, and K. the MS. at Berlin, copied by Prof. Kuhn.

1. अभवन्मिथुनं त्वष्टुः सरखूस्त्रिशिराः सह ।
2. स वै सरखूं प्रायच्छत्स्वयमेव विवस्वते ।
3. ततः सरख्या जज्ञाते यमयम्यौ विवस्वतः ।
4. तौ चाप्युभौ यमावेव ज्यायांस्तान्मां तु वै यमः ।
5. सृष्ट्वा भर्तुः परोक्षं तु सरखूः सदृशीं स्त्रियं ।
6. निक्षिप्य मिथुनं तस्यामश्वा भूत्वापचक्रते ।
7. अविज्ञानाद्विवस्वांस्तु तस्यामजनयन्मनुं ।

- |                                      |                               |                                |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. H. h. त्वेष्टुः. K. h. शर°.       | 2. K. H. h. °रखू. H. h. पाय°. | 3. H. h. सरख्यौजे°.            |
| h. °यस्यौ. °स्वतं. H. °स्व° wanting. | 4. K. H. h. वै यमौ.           | 5. K. H. h. सृष्ट्वा. K. चरखः. |
| 6. H. h. तस्यम°. K. तस्यान°.         |                               |                                |

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| 2. B. b. b <sup>2</sup> . b <sup>3</sup> . सैव.      | 3. B. सरख्यौजे°. b. b <sup>2</sup> . b <sup>3</sup> . सरख्युर्जे°. | 5. b. b <sup>2</sup> . b <sup>3</sup> . स्पृष्ट्वा. |
| 6. B. b. b <sup>2</sup> . b <sup>3</sup> . °त्तोपच°. | 7. b. b <sup>2</sup> . b <sup>3</sup> . °स्यां प्रज°.              |   |

8. राजर्षिरासीत्स मनुर्विवस्वानिव तेजसा ।
9. स विज्ञाय त्वपक्रांतां सरख्यूमश्चरूपिणीं ।
10. त्वाष्ट्रं प्रतिजगामाशु वाजी भूत्वा सलक्ष्यः ।
11. सरख्युस्तं विवस्वंतं विज्ञाय हयरूपिणं ।
12. मिथुनायोपचक्राम तां च तत्वारुरोह सः ।
13. ततस्तयोस्तु वेगेन शुक्रं तदपतद्भुवि ।
14. उपानिघ्नच्च सा त्वश्वा तच्छुक्रं गर्भकाम्यया ।
15. आघ्रातमात्वाच्छुक्रानु कुमारौ संवभूवतुः ।
16. नासत्यश्चैव दध्नश्च यौ स्तुतावश्चनाविति ।

P. 456. l. 10. (X. 17, 2.) After मनुष्येभ्यः A. C. Mill have तदुत्पत्त्यर्थैः, Ca. तदुत्पत्त्यर्थैः, CB. तदुत्पत्त्यर्थैः; B 4 had the same, but struck it out. The meaning is "for the sake of men," i.e. that men might be born, all men being the descendants of Manu, the son of Savarnā.

P. 456. l. 11. (X. 17, 2.) उपनीतवन्तः । A. Ca. C. Mill, CB. B 4. Ibid. read सरख्युः.

P. 457. l. 13. (X. 17, 4.) परिपातु ॥ परिपासि A. Ca. B 4. परिपासे C. Mill. CB. has त्वं परिपासि, leaving out परिपासति. In Taitt. Âr. VI. 1, Sâyaṇa says, त्वां प्रेतं परिपासति परिपालयितुमिच्छति दहनार्थमागच्छन्तं त्वां प्रतीक्षत इत्यर्थः ।

P. 457. l. 15. (X. 17, 4.) प्रमितं A. Ca. CB. C. Mill; deest in B 1. प्रसितं B 4. It may be meant for प्रेतं or प्रमोतं, but as all the MSS. agree on the short ि, प्रमितः may possibly have been used in the sense of प्रसिद्धः. See again in verse 5.

P. 457. l. 22. (X. 17, 5.) आशृणिः P. 1. 2. आशृणिः S. 1. 2. 3. The Taitt. Âr. reads अशृणिः, and Sâyaṇa explains it by अदीप्तः.

P. 458. l. 1. (X. 17, 5.) प्रमिते A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. प्रमिनत CB.; deest in B 1.

P. 461. l. 10. (X. 17, 11.) Read विप्रदुङ्खलं.

P. 463. l. 4. (X. 18, 1.) The name of the Rishi, according to the author of the Sarvānukramanī, is संकुसुकः, not संकसुकः. MS. S. 3 has ku, MS. 1636 sakutsuko, Shadguruśishya (MS. E. I. H. 1823) saṅkusiko and saṅkuśiko, (MS. Bodl.) saṅku-suko. All Sâyaṇa's MSS. (A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4. CB.) read संकुसुक repeatedly, the only various reading being संकुषुकः once in C. Mill. In his commentary to the Vâjasaṇeyi-Saṅhitâ, 35, 7; 15, Mahidhara gives the name of the Rishi as Saṅka-

8. K. °स्वानिव. 9. H. विज्ञानाय त्व°. h. विज्ञाना त्व°. H. h. °श्चसूरणी. 10. H. h. °मासु. वाजि. K. प्रतिजगामास्तु. 12. H. h. मिनायो°. K. मैथुनायापं° तत्वारुर्येह. 13. K. श्चक्रं. 14. H. h. तदुतं. K. °ग्रश्चसान्वश्चाक्षरुक्रं. 15. H. h. आघ्रात°. K. °छक्रानु. कुमारो. 16. h. ना° wanting. K. दध्न°. h. दध्न° सुता°.

8. B. b. b². b³. राजर्षिर्भवत्सोऽपि वि°. 10. b. b². b³. स्खल°. 11. B. b. b². b³. सरख्युश्च, °तं विदित्वा. 12. B. b. b². b³. मैथुना°. 13. B. b. b². b³. शुक्रं. 14. B. b. b². b³. °च्छुक्रं. 15. B. b. b². b³. °क्रानु. 16. b. b². b³. °सत्यैव.

suka, a word explained in the Uṇādi-sūtras II. 29. Prof. Aufrecht supposes that the author of the Sarvānukrama took the name of the Rishi from the Atharva-veda XII. 2, 11; 14, where Agni is called both saṅkasuka and vikasuka, and he proposes therefore in the Sarvānukrama also to correct Saṅkusuka into Saṅkasuka. I retain the reading of the MSS., for it is more easy to explain how the name Saṅkusuka was changed into the regular saṅkasuka than *vice versa*.

P. 463. l. 11. (X. 18, 1.) Read पंथाः.

P. 465. l. 14. (X. 18, 5.) It should be पूर्वपूर्व, one पूर्व out of three immediately following might easily have been omitted.

P. 467. l. 1. (X. 18, 8.) असुसरण° A. Ca. C. Mill, CB. असुसरण° B 4. अनुसरण° B 1. Prof. Aufrecht suggests अनुसरण°, which would certainly be the most appropriate reading.

P. 468. l. 12. (X. 18, 11.) ऊर्ध्वगतोच्चासमेन A. Ca. B 1. 4. ऊर्ध्वगतोच्चासमेन C. Mill. ऊर्ध्वगतोच्चासमेन CB.

P. 468. l. 14. (X. 18, 11.) सूपचारिका CB. स्तपचारिका A. Ca. C. Mill; deest in B 1. B 4 had the same reading as A., but altered it to तदुपचारिका.

P. 468. l. 14. (X. 18, 11.) Instead of प्रलभनं and शोभनप्रलभा (A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4) B 1 has उपलभनं and शोभनोपलभा, which seems more appropriate, because प्रलभनं is generally used in the sense of deceiving, overreaching, instead of simply reaching. In the Taitt. Âr. Sāyana explains रूपवंचना by सुपूपवंचनं स्वेच्छगमनं यस्याः सा. CB. has उपवंचनं फलं शोभनफलंता.

P. 469. l. 1. (X. 18, 12.) ते पांसवः ॥ तेषां सवा A. Ca. B 4. तेषां सवा CB. तेषा सवा C. Mill.

P. 469. l. 15. (X. 18, 13.) लोणं । A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. pr. man.; लोकं CB. In the Taitt. Âr. the published text gives लोकं, and the Commentator explains इमं लोकं लोक्यते दृश्यत इति लोको लोष्टः.

P. 469. l. 23. (X. 18, 14.) All the MSS. leave out the commentary. They write अथ चतुर्दशी ॥ प्रतीचीन इति । A. Ca. C. Mill, CB. B 4 adds in the margin, अत्र पतितो ग्रंथः ॥

P. 470. l. 23. (X. 19, 1.) सेचयत । अवगाहत् । गोदोहन° ॥ मेवयत् अवगाहत् । गोदोहन° A. मेवयत् अवगाहत् । गोदोहन° Ca. सेचयत् । अवगाहत् । ---- गोदोहन° C. Mill. मेवयत् अपगाहत् गोदोहन° B 4. सचयत् अवगाहं न स्तानापानादि° B 1. सेचयत् अवगाहनस्तानापानादि° CB.

P. 471. l. 19. (X. 19, 3.) सास्त्रादिमतीनां ॥ सास्त्रादिमतीनां A. Ca. सास्त्रादिमतीनां C. Mill. सास्त्रादिमतीनां B 4. सस्यादिप्रतीनो B 1. CB.

P. 472. l. 8. (X. 19, 4.) The commentary to संज्ञानं यत्परायणं आवर्तनं is left out in all the MSS.

P. 472. l. 26. (X. 19, 5.) Read गच्छंतीः.

P. 473. l. 1. (X. 19, 6.) Read जीवंतीभिः.

P. 474. l. 6. (X. 20.) Read सप्तमूक्तानां.

P. 478. l. 9. (X. 20, 10.) किञ्चिद्देयमस्ति ॥ किञ्चिद्देवं यमस्ति A. किञ्चिद्देवं यमस्ति Ca. किञ्चिद्देवयमस्ति C. Mill. किञ्चिद्देवं यदस्ति B 4. किञ्चिद्देयमस्ति B 1. किञ्चिद्देयमस्ति CB.

P. 478. l. 17. (X. 21.) Read अनुह्याः.

P. 483. l. 10. (X. 22, 3.) आङ् मर्यादायां । आ समाप्ते ॥ आ मर्यादायां असमाप्ते । A. Ca. CB. असमर्यादायां असमाप्ते C. Mill, B 4. आ मर्यादायां आ समाप्ते B 1.

P. 485. l. 17. (X. 22, 8.) At the end of this verse there is great confusion in all the MSS. A. has असुरप्रकृतिरित्यर्थः । एवंभूतो स्ति हे अमितहन् शत्रूणां हिंसायां समर्था भवेन, running on from verse 8 to verse 9. The same has happened in Ca. and B 4. C. Mill fortunately supplies part of the lacuna. It reads: असुरप्रकृतिरित्यर्थः । एवंभूतो स्ति हे अमितहन् शत्रूणां हंनुरि इत्वं सदायस्य उपस्थित्यस्य वधः हंता सन् शत्रु मिधि ॥ B 1, on the contrary, breaks off after अवहाराद्वाङ्मः, and continues हता सन् दंभय ते शत्रुं छिधि । CB. gives the text as I had restored it, only reading हि धि for हिंधि.

P. 486. l. 9. (X. 22, 10.) Read मरुद्व्यांश्चो°.

P. 487. l. 7. (X. 22, 12.) Sāyana seems to have read कुभ्रक्. This is the reading of A. Ca. B 1. 4. C. Mill. In CB. चं is inserted before कुभ्रक्.

P. 487. l. 17. (X. 22, 13.) सति निर्देशस्याविशेषणत्वात् ॥ सति निर्देशमाविशेषणत्वात् A. Ca. सति निर्देशमाविशेषणत्वात् C. Mill. सति निर्देशविशेषणत्वात् B 1. सति निर्देशस्याविशेषणत्वात् corr. sec. man.; सति निर्देशविशेषणत्वात् CB. I suppose it means, the final *d* of *tā* and *satyā* must be taken for the nom. plur. fem., because otherwise (*sati*, as it is) there would be no predicate to the proposition, i.e. *tā* and *satyā* would refer to nothing.

P. 487. l. 20. (X. 22, 13.) Read हिंसत्यश्च.

P. 492. l. 4. (X. 23, 7.) From सख्यानि to सख्यानि all is left out in A. Ca. B 4. In C. Mill there is a longer lacuna from वयं स्तोमं स्तोत्रं etc. to the second verse of the next hymn. The text is preserved in B 1 and CB.; B 1 reading केचिद् instead of द्वचिद्, and leaving out प्रकृष्टं मतिं. Ibid. l. 6. read जानोमः.

P. 499. l. 11. (X. 25, 9.) तस्मिन् अतिमहतीत्यर्थः ॥ तस्मिन्सति महतीत्यर्थः A. B 4. CB. तस्मिन् सति महतीत्यर्थः Ca. C. Mill. तस्मिन्सत्वाणि महतीत्यर्थः B 1.

P. 503. l. 4. (X. 26, 7.) Sāyana seems to have read अदूधोत् for दूधोत्.

P. 505. l. 22. (X. 27, 4.) शरीरवस्त्रास्त्रबलादिभिः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. sec. man. शरीरशस्त्र-बालादिभिः B 1. शरीरशस्त्राबलादिभिः CB.

P. 506. l. 2. (X. 27, 4.) प्र क्षिणां । C. Mill, B 4. sec. man. प्रदक्षिणां A. Ca. B 4. CB. प्रादक्षिणात् B 1.

P. 506. l. 8. (X. 27, 5.) वै उ इत्येवैव ॥ वै उ इत्येतैव A. Ca. वै उ इत्येतैव C. Mill. वै दु इत्येवैव B 1. तै ऊमितेतौ एव B 4. sec. man. वै इत्येतैव CB.

P. 506. l. 12. (X. 27, 5.) स्यावर° A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4. CB. स्यावरः?

P. 507. l. 14. (X. 27, 7.) Read आभूतसंज्ञं.

P. 507. l. 22. (X. 27, 7.) भवनाय गच्छंयौ ॥ भवतः lacuna प्रयुतः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4; deest in B 1. भवनाय गंत्यौ यद्वा सर्वस्य प्रकर्षेण ह्यादियच्चौ रेफश्चांदसः । CB.

P. 508. l. 9. (X. 27, 9.) The commentary is left out in all the MSS. In B 4 there is a note पतितोऽत्र ऋगर्थः.

P. 509. l. 7. (X. 27, 11.) लिटि रूपं B 1. लेटि रूपं A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. स्यालटि रूपं CB.

P. 509. l. 15. (X. 27, 11.) वरयितुं । B 1. CB. वारयितुं A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4.

P. 510. l. 10. (X. 27, 13.) From वृष्टिलक्षणमुदकं to वृष्टिलक्षणमुदकं all is left out in A. Ca. C. Mill. B 1. CB. and B 4. (in marg.) give जिगति instead of गिरति ।

P. 510. l. 23. (X. 27, 14.) पराशदनवर्जितो ॥ पराशदनवर्जितो A. Ca. पराशदनवर्जितो C. Mill. परासादनवर्जितो B 4. sec. man. परासादनवर्जितो B 1. CB. Cf. Nir. XII. 29.

P. 512. l. 7. (X. 27, 16.) निवासं । CB. गतिनिवासं A. Ca. B 1. 4; deest in C. Mill. It would be better to read तत्र निवासं.

P. 512. l. 15. (X. 27, 17.) Read पङ्कवन्तो instead of पङ्कवन्तो.

P. 512. l. 16. (X. 27, 17.) देवानां. A. Ca. have देवाना, B 4. देवनां, B 1. देवोना, CB. देवता; deest in C. Mill.

P. 512. l. 18. (X. 27, 17.) After यद्वा some other explanation was probably left out, which makes the following sentence unintelligible.

P. 513. l. 19. (X. 27, 19.) युगा युगमानि A. Ca. CB. B 1. 4. युगानि C. Mill.

P. 514. l. 4. (X. 27, 20.) सुष्ठु पूजितौ । MSS. ; सुष्ठु योजितौ?

P. 514. l. 6. (X. 27, 20.) यज्ञान्मापगमय ॥ यज्ञान् मा गमय A. Ca. B 1. 4. यज्ञान मा गमय । C. Mill. यज्ञान् मा गय CB.

P. 518. l. 9. (X. 28, 4.) Read अत्सारीत् for अत्सार्त्.

P. 518. l. 10. (X. 28, 4.) अभिगहनदेशात् B 4. अभिहनदेशात् A. Ca. C. Mill. निर्गहनदेशात् B 1. CB.

P. 519. l. 19. (X. 28, 7.) शूरमसं A. Ca. C. Mill, CB. B 4. शूरं समर्थं B 1.

P. 520. l. 15. (X. 28, 9.) बलवत्कूरं मृ° ॥ बलचक्रूरस्य मृ° A. Ca. बलचक्रूरस्य मृ° C. Mill. बल-चक्रूरशूरं B 1. B 4. sec. man. बलचक्रूरशूरं CB. The passage is corrupt, and I can suggest no emendation. Prof. Aufrecht suggests बलंगवत्कूरं.

P. 521. l. 7. (X. 28, 10.) लोलया A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. CB. क्रोडया B 1.

P. 521. l. 12. (X. 28, 11.) In this verse the Pada MSS. (P. 1. P. 2) read गोधाः, probably in order to avoid the hiatus. In the commentary A. Ca. B 4 have गोधाः, B 1. CB. गोधा; deest in C. Mill.

P. 522. l. 17. (X. 29, 1.) See Nir. VI. 28. The commentary begins with चने न वायो न्यायीति in A. Ca. B 4. CB. There is a lacuna in B 1; in C. Mill there is a long omission from X. 28, 11 to X. 29, 7. The commentary here, and X. 30, 11, is the same as that given by Durga. Durga's MS. (E. I. H. 357) leaves out वृक्ष इव; leaves out from मनुष्याणां to मध्ये; has सोमभागी for सोमभागः; एवं तावद् for एतावद्; has इयमृग्भवति; नि for अहनि; पश्यति for पश्यन्निव; has यः स्तोमस्तस्य किमिति; has पूर्वैर्गोधार्येन; leaves out वा before कामयमान; has न्यायीति एतद्; has एवमेतस्मिन्पदद्वये । At the end Durga continues his argument: कथं द्विपदत्वे हि सति वाशब्दस्यार्थेन केनविद्वचित्वं । न चेह विकल्पः समुच्चयो वा कश्चिदर्थोऽस्ति । स्यादेतत् । उपमार्थे भविष्यतीति । तदपि न संभवतीति । नकारोपमाथैस्य कृतत्वात् । य इत्यस्यापि पृथग्भूतस्य न कश्चिदर्थोऽस्ति । तस्मादाख्यातस्यानुदात्तत्वादर्थासंभवाच्च द्विपदत्वे वाय इत्येतदेकपदमेव । शकुनिपुत्र एव चास्याभिधेय उपपद्यते ।

P. 524. l. 2. (X. 29, 2.) कुत्सेन । कुत्सो । कुत्सो A. Ca. B 4; deest in C. Mill. कुत्सेन B 1. CB.

P. 524. l. 6. (X. 29, 3.) All MSS. have रंस्वो, not रंस्वो.

P. 526. l. 1. (X. 29, 6.) मज्जकेन A. Ca. B 1. 4. मज्जकेन CB.; deest in C. Mill.



P. 526. l. 5. (X. 29, 6.) आस्वादिताः ॥ अस्माभिर्देवताः A. Ca. B 4. अस्मादताः B 1. अस्मादन्ताः CB.

P. 530. l. 16. (X. 30, 7.) ता हिंसनात् ॥ ताभिः हिंसनात् A. Ca. B 4. C. Mill. ताभिः हिंसात् CB.; deest in B 1.

P. 532. l. 21. (X. 30, 11.) निरुक्तटीकाया उद्धृतं ॥ निरुक्तटीकायां उद्धृतं A. Ca. निरुक्तटीकाया उद्धृतं B 4. C. Mill.; deest in B 1. In CB. एतस्याज्ञो व्याख्यानं निरुक्तटीकायां उद्धृतं 1. The commentary is taken nearly literally from Durga's commentary.

P. 536. l. 3. (X. 31, 3.) Read अभिप्राप्तवान्.

P. 536. l. 16. (X. 31, 4.) After वाग्भिः CB. alone has स्तुतः.

P. 538. l. 9. (X. 31, 8.) एतावदेवजातं सामर्थ्येन युक्तमिति न । अपि तु ॥ एतावदेवजातं सामर्थ्येन युक्तं इति । अपि तु A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. एताः देवा वा जात सामर्थ्येन युक्तं । एतेभ्यो B 1. एता देवा जातं सामर्थ्येन तु युक्तं एता एतेभ्यो CB.

P. 540. l. 5. (X. 32, 1.) The devatâ is Indraḥ.

P. 541. l. 1. (X. 32, 2.) रजः शब्दाज्जस आकारः ॥ रजः शब्दा स आकारः A. Ca. C. Mill. राजशब्दाज्जस आकारः B 1. रजः शब्दा जस आकारः CB. रजः शब्दाज्जस आकारः B 4. It looks like a marginal gloss inserted in the text. The intention was most likely to take रजसा for राजांसि.

P. 542. l. 1. (X. 32, 4.) दीप्यस्व A. Ca. B 1. 4. CB.

P. 542. l. 3. (X. 32, 4.) प्रापणसाधनं । A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4. CB. प्रपानसाधनं ?

P. 542. l. 4. (X. 32, 4.) यत आगत्य प्रकाशयतोऽत्र कारणमाह ॥ यतः आगत्य प्रकाशयेत्यत्र कारणमाह A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. यतः आगत्य प्रकाशयेत्यत्र तात्पर्यमाह B 1. यतः आगत्य प्रकाशयत्यत्र तारणमाह CB.

P. 542. l. 9. (X. 32, 4.) धारय instead of दीपय ।

P. 543. l. 17. (X. 32, 7.) The explanation of क्षेत्रविदं संप्राद is found in C. Mill only.

P. 544. l. 18. (X. 32, 9.) After हे कलश A. Ca. C. Mill have कलाशन्, CB. कलशान्. It is struck out in B 4, but not in B 1.

P. 544. l. 27. (X. 32, 9.) क्रियाम मयवानः कुरुश्रवणाः । पूजायां बहुवचनपदं ॥ क्रियामः कुरुश्रवणाः पूजायां बहुवचनं पदं A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4; deest in B 1. क्रियाम दवानः कुरुश्रवणा पूजायां बहुवचनं । एवं.

P. 546. l. 12. (X. 33, 2.) पार्श्वीस्थीनि ॥ पार्श्वीस्थानि A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. पार्श्वीस्थानि B 1. पार्श्वीस्थीनी CB. Cf. Sāyana to I. 105, 8.

P. 547. l. 19. (X. 33, 5.) प्रतिष्ठवाहिनं रथं ॥ प्रतिष्ठवाहिनं त रथं च A. Ca. प्रतिष्ठवाहिनं रथं च C. Mill. प्रतिष्ठवाहिनं रथं च B 4. प्रतिष्ठवाहिनं रथं B 1. प्रतिष्ठवाहिनं रथं CB. Prof. Aufrecht suggests the certain emendation प्रतिवाहिनं.

P. 549. l. 7. (X. 34, 1.) The name of the second supposed poet is Maujavân Aksha, (MS. E. I. H. 132 writes Mojavân, by mistake.) The commentator of the Anukramaṇi explains Maujavân as Mûjavatputra, and he is quite aware of the irregularity in the formation of the patronymic, for he says that, although the patronymic suffix has been omitted, the Vṛiddhi of the first syllable has been preserved. Hence Maujavat, instead of Maujavata. Roth in his Dictionary gives the name as Maujavata, but this is wrong, for Shaḍguruśishya quotes Sauvishtakṛit as a parallel case, clearly showing that the name he wished to explain was Maujavat, nom. sing. Maujavân. The name, no doubt, is irregular

even thus, yet we have no right to change it. Sāyana explains the name by मुञ्जवनः पुत्रः (A. Ca. C. Mill, CB.), or मुञ्जवतः पुत्रः (B 1. 4), the *u* being given as short.

P. 549. l. 8. (X. 34. 1.) अत्र द्वादश्यक्षान्सौति । Here all the MSS. are at fault, and possibly Sāyana himself or whosoever wrote the passage. I shall first give the various readings :

- A. अत्र द्वादशाख्यान् सौति नवम्याद्या वा तस्मात्सहैवत्यः सप्तमी त्रयोदशी च कृषिं सौति । अतस्तयोस्ता देवता ।  
 Ca. अत्र द्वादशाख्यान् सौति नवम्याद्या वा तस्मात्सहैवत्यः सप्तमी त्रयोदशी च कृषिं सौति । अतस्तयोस्ता देवता ।  
 B 4. अत्र द्वादशाख्यान् सौति नवम्याद्या ..... सहैवत्यः । सप्तमी त्रयोदशी च कृषिं सौति । अतस्तयोस्ता देवता ।  
 C. Mill अत्र द्वादशी खान् सौति नवम्याद्या च तु स्त्री सहैवत्यः सप्तमी त्रयोदशी च क्षपि सौति । अतस्तयोःस्ता देवता ।  
 B 1. अत्र द्वादश्या खान् सौति न त्रयम्याद्या त सहैवत्यः सप्तमी त्रयोदशी च कृषिं सौति । अतः स्तयोः सा देवती ।  
 B 2. अत्र द्वादश्या खान् सौति न त्रयम्याद्या त सहैवत्यः सप्तमी त्रयोदशी च कृषिं सौति अतः स्तयोः सा देवती ।  
 CB. अत्रा द्वादश्यक्षान् सौति नवम्याद्या वा तस्मात्सहैवत्यः सप्तमी त्रयोदशी च कृषिं सौति अतस्तयोः सा देवता ।

- A. एवं पंच गताः शिष्टाभिर्नवभिः कितवो ख्याश्च निंदन्ते । अतस्ता अपि तदेवत्यः ।  
 Ca. एवं पंच गताः शिष्टाभिर्नवभिः कितवो ख्याश्च निंदन्ते । अतस्ता अपि तदेवत्यः ।  
 B 4. एवं पंच गताः शिष्टाभिर्नवभिः कितवो ख्याश्च निंदन्ते । अतस्ता अपि तदेवत्यः ।  
 C. Mill एवं पंच गताः शिष्टाभिर्नवभिः कितवो ख्याश्च निंदन्ते । अतस्ता अपि तदेवत्याः ।  
 B 1. एवं पंच गताः शिष्टाभिर्नवभिः कितवो ख्याश्च मण्यते । अतस्तो अपि तदेवत्याः ।  
 B 2. एवं पंच गताः शिष्टाभिर्नवभिः कितवो ख्याश्च मण्यते । अतस्तो अपि तदेवत्याः ।  
 CB. एवं पंच गताः शिष्टाभिर्नवभिः कितवो ख्याश्च निंदन्ते । अतस्ता अपि तदेवत्यः ।

Now it is clear that the seventh verse does not praise agriculture; nor would it be *stauti* in the singular, if two verses were intended. Nevertheless we have *tayoh*, a dual, as if two verses were intended. Shadgurusishya in his commentary to the Anukramanī says : तत्राखान्द्वादशी सौति नवम्याद्या च सप्तमी त्रयोदशी कृषिं सौति कितवं चानुशासति शिष्टाभिर्नवभिस्त्वक्षाः कितवश्चैव निंदन्ते । This is clearly metrical, and evidently taken from the Brihaddevatā, where the following verses occur : प्रवेपा मेति मूकं यत्तदक्षस्तुतिरुच्यते । अत्राखान्द्वादशी सौति नवम्याद्या च सप्तमी ॥ त्रयोदशी कृषिं सौति कितवं चानुशासति (read तो) । अक्षास्तु शेषा निंदन्ति । If we look at this, we see what has happened. Sāyana has taken the Brihaddevatā, quoted it, and inserted after each paragraph some words of explanation. In doing this he seems to have drawn सप्तमी and त्रयोदशी together, without altering the verb *stauti*, but putting, when he speaks for himself, the dual *tayoh*, as referring to the seventh and thirteenth verses. What he ought to have said was this : अत्र द्वादश्यक्षान्सौति नवम्याद्या च सप्तमी । अतस्तासहैवत्याः । त्रयोदशी कृषिं सौति । अतस्तस्या सा देवता । This is, no doubt, a greater alteration of the text of Sāyana than would be permissible according to the critical principles followed in this edition. But both grammar and sense required this deviation, and the various readings as given above will enable every reader to form his own opinion.

P. 549. l. 18. (X. 34. 1.) The MSS. of Sāyana write विभीतक and विभीतक instead of विभीदक, and मुञ्जवत् instead of मूञ्जवत्.

P. 551. l. 13. (X. 34, 5.) अवहितो । B 1. CB. अवहता A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. One expects अवहीनो, but as the next sentence seems to depend on this word, it can only be अवहितो, in the sense of attentive.

P. 552. l. 8. (X. 34, 7.) चंकुश्वन्तः and नितोदिवन्तः as nom. plur. in A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1 (doubtful); but चंकुश्वन्तः and नितोदिवन्तः in CB, and sec. man. also in B 4, where originally both words were in the nom. plur. But for the uncertainty of the MSS. the gen. sing. would be best in both words. The commentary shows why Sâyaṇa might have taken the seventh verse as a कृषिस्तुतिः.

P. 552. l. 9. (X. 34, 7.) पुरुषस्य कृषौ प्रवर्तमानस्य ॥ पुरुषस्य कृषौ प्रवर्तमाने A. Ca. पुरुषे द्यूनप्रवर्तमाने C. Mill. पुरुषस्य कृषौ प्रवर्तमानस्य B 1. पुरुषस्य च कृषौ प्रवर्तमाने B 4. पुरुषस्य कृषौ प्रवर्तमाने CB.

P. 553. l. 9. (X. 34, 9.) अपकृता A. Ca. B 4. CB. B 1. अपा क्षताः CB.

P. 554. l. 24. (X. 34, 13.) रतिं कुरु A. Ca. B 1. 4. CB.; deest in C. Mill. Prof. Aufrecht suggests रतिं कुरु ।

P. 559. l. 3. (X. 35, 9.) तिष्ठ A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4. CB.

P. 561. l. 17. (X. 36, 1.) सः सर्वे च ॥ सः सर्गे च यद्वयं A. Ca. सः सर्वे च यद्वयं C. Mill. सः सर्गे च यद्वयं B 4. सः सर्वे च B 1. सः सर्वे च CB.

P. 566. l. 24. (X. 37, 1.) The Viniyoga of X. 40, 10, is added here in A. Ca. C. Mill, CB. B 4. In B 1 it is inserted in the margin.

P. 571. l. 19. (X. 38, 1.) तांडवाशाढ्यायनका ॥ तांडवीशाढ्यायनका A. B 4. तांडवा शाढ्यायनका Ca. तांडवा शाढ्यायनका C. Mill. तांडवा छाढ्यायनका CB.; deest in B 1. तांडवशाढ्यायनका?

P. 573. l. 18. (X. 38, 5.) The quotation from the Śātyāyanaka could not be verified, as in spite of repeated efforts, I have not succeeded in finding any copy of that work in India. Sâyaṇa's quotation, however, from the Śātyāyanaka agrees very much with the passage in the Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa IX. 2; in fact, it does so to a greater degree than the extract given by Sâyaṇa as from the Chândoga-Brāhmaṇa. I take this opportunity of mentioning a correction in another extract from the Śātyāyanaka, p. 106. l. 5, where Prof. Aufrecht has shown that भावे तत् should be तावेतत्. Ibid. l. 4. read प्रतिममृशते.

P. 575. l. 10. (X. 39, 3.) Sâyaṇa seems to have read ऋतस्य for रुतस्य. A. Ca. CB. B 4 read ऋतस्य, C. Mill रुतस्य, B 1. कृतस्य.

P. 575. l. 17. (X. 39, 4.) पुनर्बुधानं B 1. पुनर्नवीनं A. Ca. C. Mill, CB. B 4.

P. 576. l. 13. (X. 39, 6.) संबन्धिनमिममाह्वानं A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4. CB. Sâyaṇa has evidently used आह्वान as a masculine. According to यदनांतमकर्तारि (Am. Kosha III. 6, 3, 24) it would be impossible; according to भावे व्युदंतः (Siddh. Kaum. ed. Tārānātha, vol. II. p. 633) it might be defended.

P. 576. l. 23. (X. 39, 7.) विमदे A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. pr. विमदाय B 1. B 4. sec. man. CB.

P. 577. l. 9. (X. 39, 8.) The commentary to the first line is left out in A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. It is given in B 1. CB. Ibid. l. 10. read युवत्त्व°.

P. 579. l. 2. (X. 39, 11.) संसारभयं । CB. C. Mill. सारभयं A. Ca. B 4. संज्ञामयं B 1.

- P. 579. l. 20. (X. 39, 13.) यातमिंद्रं । B 1. CB. C. Mill. यातमिंद्रं A. Ca. B 4.
- P. 581. l. 24. (X. 40, 3.) वंदिनो वाणी कापा । तथा ॥ वंदीनो वरणीकापातया A. Ca. वदीनो वणीकापातया C. Mill. वंदिनो वाणीकापातया B 1. 4. वंदितो वाणी सापातया CB.
- P. 582. l. 1. (X. 40, 3.) राजकुमारीव CB. B 1. राजकुमारीव A. Ca. राजकुमारीव C. Mill. राजकुमारीव B 4, but राजकुमारीव B 4. sec. man.
- P. 582. l. 10. (X. 40, 4.) युवं युवां A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4. CB. युवं युवान्मां?
- P. 590. l. 1. (X. 42, 5.) पूर्वोद्भूतः ॥ पूर्वोद्भूतः B 1. CB. B 4. sec. man. पूर्वोद्भूतः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4.
- P. 591. l. 11. (X. 42, 9.) Read अतिःदीव्यं ।
- P. 591. l. 23. (X. 42, 10.) प्रथमाः । Sâyana leaves it free to read प्रथमा or प्रथमाः. Pada 1. 2. read प्रथमाः; Aufrecht leaves it open.
- P. 592. l. 13. (X. 42, 11.) सखिभूतेन्द्रः A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4. CB.
- P. 593. l. 1. (X. 43, 1.) आगिरसस्य कृष्णस्य A. Ca. C. Mill, B 4. हे घोषेयस्य सुहस्य CB. हे घोषेयस्य सुहस्यस्य B 1. Ibid. l. 12. read तद्विक्.
- P. 594. l. 16. (X. 43, 5.) परस्थानां CB. C. Mill. परस्थानां A. Ca. B 4. परस्थानां B 1.
- P. 594. l. 21. (X. 43, 5.) पूर्वोऽपि ॥ पुत्रो पि A. Ca. C. Mill, B 1. 4. CB.
- P. 595. l. 6. (X. 43, 6.) Read तीव्रकैः ।
- P. 599. l. 1. (X. 44, 5.) Read यस्मिंस्तं. In changing the usual spelling of the MSS. न त°, the necessary insertion of the स्, I am sorry to say, has not always been attended to. Ibid. l. 3. read धृष्याणि.
- P. 599. l. 15. (X. 44, 6.) The extract from Yâska differs, as it does frequently, from the text of the printed edition and the MSS. of Yâska.
- P. 600. l. 2. (X. 44, 7.) य उपरे । All the MSS. read ये अपरे.
- P. 600. l. 17. (X. 44, 8.) वृष्णः सोदरस्यासेकृन्सोमान्पीत्वा मदे सति ॥ सोमं पीत्वा मदे सति वृष्णः सोदरस्यासकृत् सोमान् पीत्वा उक्थे सति A. Ca. (सोरस्यासकृत्, उक्थे सति deest, C. Mill.) B 4 had the same as A., but sec. manu it inserts सोमरसस्य, सेकृन्, and मदे for उक्थे. B. has सोमं पीत्वा मदे सति वृष्णः सोमरसस्ये सेकृन् सोमान् पीत्वा मदे सति. CB. reads वृष्णः सोदरस्ये सेकृन् सोमान् पीत्वा उक्थे सति.
- P. 601. ll. 15 and 16. (X. 45, 1.) The name of the Rishi of this hymn, and of hymn IX. 68, is called by the author of the Sarvânukramanî Vatsapris, not Vatsapris. The MS. (S. 3) in IX. 68 has सप्रिभै°, in X. 45. वत्सप्रि षं राग्नेयं. Shadguru-śishya in IX. 68 has वत्सप्रि: twice, in X. 45. वत्सप्रि: thrice. Sâyana in IX. 68 has the genitive वत्सप्रे: and nom. वत्सप्रि:, supported by all the MSS., and likewise in X. 45 the gen. वत्सप्रे: and the nom. वत्सप्रि:, without any various reading. In later works the name became वत्सप्रि:, see Boehlingk and Roth, Dict. s. v.
- P. 602. l. 4. (X. 45, 1.) सुप्रज्ञाता ॥ सुप्रज्ञो नेता A. Ca. सुप्रज्ञाता C. Mill. सुप्रज्ञो नेता CB. सुप्रज्ञो नेता B 4. sec. man. B 1.
- P. 605. l. 23. (X. 45, 9.) Read युवतम ।
- P. 607. l. 3. (X. 45, 12.) The commentary to the first line is left out in all MSS.

After repeated researches Dr. Rost, the Librarian of the India Office, has just succeeded in finding the missing volumes of MS. B 1. I am therefore able to supply the following various readings for pages 1-85 :

P. 4. l. 19, B 1 reads स्वरः; P. 11. l. 16, शौनकस्याप्रास्तकं; P. 12. l. 5, quotation omitted as in B 4; P. 20. l. 16, लोमानि in B 1. 4; P. 31. l. 4, like B 4; P. 32. l. 17, like B 4; P. 32. l. 24, like B 4, except दशायवित्तं; P. 34. l. 19, like B 4; P. 35. l. 11, like B 4; P. 37. l. 7, like B 4; P. 37. l. 8, like B 4; P. 38. l. 19, like B 4, except गवा क्षायः; P. 38. l. 26, like B 4; P. 39. l. 5, like B 4; P. 39. l. 23, like B 4, except अचायती; P. 40. l. 4, like B 4; P. 40. l. 6, like B 4; P. 42. l. 14, like B 4, except the marginal gloss; P. 43. l. 4, like B 4; P. 43. l. 22, like B 4; P. 44. l. 17, like B 4; P. 45. l. 1, like B 4, except अस्यः, which was the original reading of B 4 also; असौष्य° (B 4 has असौष्य°), and सोमस्य twice (once struck out in B 4); P. 45. l. 14, like B 4; P. 48. l. 17, like B 4, except अभिमतः; P. 48. l. 23, like B 4, except अदातु°; P. 49. l. 5, like B 4, except सामीनि; P. 49. l. 23, like B 4; P. 50. l. 4, like B 4, except दाता, which may have been the original reading of B 4 also; P. 50. l. 17, like B 4; P. 51. l. 23, like B 4, except आपवः; P. 51. l. 24, like B 4; P. 52. l. 4, like B 4; P. 52. l. 5, like B 4; P. 52. l. 10, like B 4; P. 52. l. 11, like B 4; P. 53. l. 1, like B 4; P. 54. l. 11, like B 4; P. 54. l. 15, like B 4; P. 54. l. 21, like B 4; P. 55. l. 19, like B 4; P. 56. l. 7, अयुषक्; P. 57. l. 20, like B 4; P. 58. l. 1, like B 4; P. 58. l. 2, like B 4; P. 59. l. 13, like B 4; P. 59. l. 19, like B 4; P. 61. l. 19, like B 4; P. 62. l. 1, like B 4; P. 62. l. 13, like B 4; P. 63. l. 9, like B 4; P. 64. l. 8, like B 4; P. 64. l. 23, like B 4; P. 67. l. 9, like B 4; P. 67. l. 10, like B 4; P. 67. l. 12, like B 4; P. 67. l. 19, l. 20, like B 4, except (यथा); P. 68. l. 3, l. 4, like B 4; P. 69. l. 4, l. 22, like B 4; P. 70. l. 1, l. 8, like B 4; P. 71. l. 18, like B 4; P. 72. l. 18, like B 4; P. 73. l. 5, like B 4; P. 74. l. 15, l. 21, like B 4; P. 75. l. 15, l. 17, like B 4; P. 77. l. 10, like B 4; P. 80. l. 11, like B 4; P. 80. l. 12, B 1 explains भूक्षयः by भरणशीलाः, and the क्षरणशीलाः of B 4 was clearly meant for the same; P. 80. l. 13, l. 14, like B 4; P. 80. l. 19, like B 4, except राक्षससंबन्धनं; P. 80. l. 19, like B 4; P. 81. l. 15 (IX. 41, 5), like B 4; P. 82. l. 21, like B 4; P. 84. l. 18, like B 4; P. 84. l. 20, like B 4.

